

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIII.—OCTOBER, 1908—No. 132.

PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

III.

IN THE early part of the year 1801 General Bonaparte, who had held the position of First Consul since November, 1799, instituted an inquiry into the situation of the French Republic, and several of the most distinguished members of the Council of State were sent into the provinces for that purpose. Their reports on the social, political and religious conditions existing in the various departments were founded on the information they obtained from the prefects and the heads of the public services, and they present a vivid picture of the state of France at the time when Cardinal Consalvi arrived in Paris for the conclusion of the negotiations which were to reconcile the republic with the Holy See. They all agree in representing France after ten years of revolutionary government as being thoroughly disorganized, demoralized and impoverished, but also as having begun to show some signs of improvement since the overthrow of the Directory and the establishment of the Consulate.

In the southern departments there were still to be found some bands of brigands composed mostly of disbanded soldiers, but their numbers had been much reduced since the days of the Directory, for during the four preceding months, under the Consular Govern-

ment, no less than 190 had been shot.¹ In most of the western departments the Chouans, or partisans of the Bourbons, were for the most part discouraged and obliged to conceal themselves, but in some districts gangs of deserters and unemployed workmen, led by former Vendean chiefs, made raids on the tax-gatherers to carry off the public money or robbed travelers on the highways and had stores of arms and ammunition hidden in the woods.² In the department of La Vendée the many deserted villages and the blackened remains of farmhouses, castles and churches to be seen on all sides still bore witness to the fury of the civil war which had for so long desolated the country and had left in the minds of the peasantry a feeling of intense aversion for the republic. In every part of France the buildings which had belonged to the Church or to the nobility and had been confiscated by the revolutionary government were falling into ruins, for since they had been seized they were no longer kept in repair and their state of deterioration sufficed to identify them as national property.³ In Provence sixty thousand acres of marshy land which had been reclaimed in the reign of Louis XIV. were now again under water.⁴ The ports of La Rochelle and of Rochefort were being gradually filled up with sand, their jetties were breaking down and would be soon swept away.⁵ The embankments along the Rhine and those in the recently conquered Belgian provinces on the coasts of the North Sea were in an alarming condition and the neighboring district was in danger of being submerged.⁶ From one end of France to the other the greater part of the highroads, in some localities as many as four-fifths, were completely broken up, full of deep holes and generally resembling ploughed fields. In some departments almost all the communications had been interrupted.⁷

The hospitals and the schools of France had also suffered from

¹ Félix Rocquain, *L'état de la France au 18 Brumaire d'après les rapports des Conseillers d'état chargés d'une enquête sur la situation de la République*. Paris, 1874, p. 14. Rapport sur la 8^e division militaire par François de Nantes, le 6 Floréal an x. (26 April, 1801). The eighth division comprised the departments of Vaucluse, Bouches-du-Rhône, Var, Basses-Alpes and Alpes-Maritimes.

² *Id.*, p. 118. Mémoire de Barbé-Marbois pour rendre compte de sa mission dans la 13^e division militaire. Le 5 Nivôse an ix. (26 December, 1800). The thirteenth division comprised the departments of les Côtes-du-Nord, Finistère, Ille-et-Vilaine and Morbihan.

³ *Id.*, p. 61. Rapport de François de Nantes.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 38. *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*, p. 143. Compte-rendu par le citoyen Fourcroy de sa mission dans la 12^e division militaire. Le 5 Nivôse an ix. (26 December, 1800). The twelfth division comprised the departments of les Deux-Sèvres, la Charente-Inférieure, la Vendée, la Loire-Inférieure. "Les quais du port de la Rochelle sont dégradés et menacent ruine. . . . Les bassins sont encombrés de sable et de vase. . . . Rochefort, ce magnifique ou rage de Louis XIV., court les mêmes dangers."

the rapacity of the different revolutionary governments which had succeeded each other and from their inability to replace the institutions which they overthrew by any well devised system of public relief or of education. From a report presented to the *Assemblée Constituante* in 1791 it appears that there were then in France 2,185 hospitals, whose revenues amounted to 38,000,000 of *livres* (about \$7,600,000).⁸ The first attack on their wealth was made by the decree of February 19, 1791, when the *Assemblée* suppressed all the tolls and duties levied at the entrance of towns and villages, which had formed a large portion of their income, and by the same decree named a committee to ascertain what new taxes should take their place.⁹ The convention two years later undertook to reorganize the assistance of the poor, which by the decree of March 19, 1793, it declared to be a debt which should be discharged by the nation. As soon, therefore, as a system of public assistance could be established and put in working order all the property of the hospitals was to become national property and be administered or sold by the State, which would then allot a certain sum every year to each department for the relief of the poor. Many other decrees on the same subject followed. Stringent measures were enacted for the suppression of mendicity, and a book entitled "*le livre de la bienfaisance nationale*" (the book of national beneficence) was to be opened in every department, in which the names of the persons who were entitled to relief were to be inscribed. These laws, however, were soon laid aside and forgotten. It is true that, in the course of the year 1795, the government gave 20,000,000 of *livres* in paper money for the assistance of the poor, but the result of the sale of the property of the hospitals was so disastrous that it was soon suspended. A decree voted on the 3d Brumaire an IV. (25 October, 1795) restored to the hospitals the revenues derived from their domains, though not the ownership of their domains, which were still left in the power of the nation,¹⁰ with the right of sale. Their losses, however, had been so great that it is not surprising to find that towards the end of the Directory the hospitals and almshouses, with very few exceptions, had fallen into the utmost distress and were barely able to support their inmates.

⁸ *Id.*, p. 220. Compte-rendu par le citoyen Fourcroy de sa mission dans la 16^e division militaire pendant les mois de Pheviôse et Ventôse, an x. (21 January-21 March, 1802). The sixteenth division comprised le Nord, le Pas-de-Calais, la Lys, the last being a Belgian department.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 53. Rapport de Français de Nantes, p. 135. Rapport de Fourcroy. "On se plaint généralement des routes en France. Partout elles sont dégradées au point que cette plainte se fait entendre d'un bout de la République à l'autre."

¹⁰ Alexandre Monnier, *Histoire de l'Assistance publique dans les temps anciens et modernes*. Paris, 1858, p. 441.

⁹ Réimpression de l'Ancien Moniteur, t. VII., p. 431.

¹⁰ *Id.*, t. XXVI, p. 318. Le 3 brumaire an IV. (25 October, 1795).

The inspectors forward the same complaints from all parts of France. In the hospitals of Normandy, with the exception of Rouen, "the aged and the infirm were in rags, without covering to their beds and on the verge of starvation."¹¹ A nearly similar report comes from Toulon. In the *Pas-de-Calais* and *le Lord* there was a slight amelioration, but the income of the hospitals had been much reduced, while the number of the poor had increased. It was not the first time that such complaints had been made, for a few years previously the municipality of Bayeux had appealed for help to the *Corps Législatif* and described the inhabitants of their almshouses as living skeletons."¹²

Still more wretched was the condition of the deserted children received into these establishments or boarded out by them. At Marseilles of those lodged in the poorhouses only eighteen had survived out of 618; at Toulon, 4 out of 104.¹³ In other parts of France their exact number was not known owing to the carelessness of the administration, but their foster parents had been so irregularly paid that it was calculated that the amount due to them might be as much as 25,000,000 of *livres*.

The educational system in France had become as disorganized under the Republican government as every other institution. According to a report presented by M. de Villemain to Louis Philippe in 1843, there were in France in 1789 21 universities, 562 colleges or secondary schools and 72 professional and special schools, but further researches have raised the number of the secondary schools to not less than 900.¹⁴ The existence of these establishments had always been well known, but it is only of late years that the careful researches of many historians among the archives of provincial towns have brought to light the great numbers of small primary schools which existed in every part of France and which were not paid by the State, but were supported either by local taxation or by special foundations, mostly owing to the clergy.¹⁵ The State left the supervision of these schools and the nomination of the masters to the Bishops, and interfered by means of the functionaries known as "*Intendants de province*" only when it was necessary to authorize the levy of taxes by the municipalities or to decide in case of litigation between the communities and the masters they employed.

¹¹ Rocquain, p. 186. *Rapport de Fourcroy.*

¹² Le 5 thermidor an vii. (23 July, 1799). Rocquain, p. 424.

¹³ *Id.*, p. 33. *Rapport de Français de Nantes.*

¹⁴ M. Silvy, *Les Collèges en France avant la Révolution*; quoted by L'Abbé Augustin Cicard, *Les Études classiques avant la Révolution*. Paris, 1887, p. 536.

¹⁵ L'Abbé E. Allain, *L'Instruction primaire avant la Révolution*. Paris, 1881, pp. 267-269.

The *Assemblée Constituante* and the *Assemblée Législative* swept away this popular and widely spread system of education by destroying the resources on which it subsisted. The principal among these had been the tithes, which were abolished on August 4, 1789. The confiscation of the property of the clergy followed, and then the suppression of the various tolls. The loss of their income was not the only blow which struck down the primary and secondary schools. The *Assemblée* enacted that all functionaries employed in the department of public instruction should take the oath of the Constitution or lose their places.¹⁶ The great majority of the clergy had already refused to take this oath, and had been in consequence driven from their churches. Most of the ecclesiastical professors, too, followed their example and left their schools, which thus caused the breaking up of all seminaries and houses of education directed by priests.¹⁷ The lay professors, however, for the most part remained, as probably the oath was not demanded so rigorously from them. Much, too, depended on the tendencies of the various municipalities and the amount of toleration which they chose to extend to the Catholics. But it is a remarkable fact that wherever the professors, lay or clerical, obeyed the decree and took the oath, the greater part of the parents withdrew their children from the school. The complete disorganization of education in France was the speedy result of this ill-judged legislation, the guiding motive of which was anti-religious fanaticism. As early as September, 1791, Talleyrand had vainly requested the *Assemblée* to take immediate steps to reorganize public instruction, for, as he said, "the universities have everywhere suspended their work; the colleges are without subordination, without professors, without pupils."

In the beginning of 1793, however, the Convention decreed the sale of the property of all educational establishments except the buildings and the gardens, and at the same time the Committee of Public Instruction, acting under the influence of the Committee of Public Safety, brought forward bills for new decrees. No less than six of these were voted with regard to primary education alone from May 30, 1793, to October 25, 1795, all differing in their chief features, but all equally anti-Christian in their tendencies. The last named decree, known as the law of the 3d Brumaire an IV. (25

¹⁶ *Moniteur*, t. VIII, p. 137. 15 April, 1791.

¹⁷ L'Abbé E. Allain, *L'Œuvre scolaire de la Révolution*. Paris, 1891, p. 9. Victor Stanislaus Pierre, *L'École sous la Révolution*. Paris, 1881, p. 36. The Brothers of the Christian Schools had in France, in 1778, 114 houses and 30,990 pupils. According to M. Taine, there were in France in 1789 about 37,000 nuns, owning 1,500 houses, many hundreds of which had schools; a large number also gave gratuitous primary instruction. Among these, the Ursulines had, in 1789, 300 schools; Les Filles de la Charité, 500; Les Sœurs de la Providence, 116. Victor Pierre, p. 40.

October, 1795), excluded all Catholic teaching from the schools which it founded by ordering instruction to be given in "the elements of republican morality," which was merely another name for the deistical doctrines of the "*Théophiliophropes*." Complaints, however, soon arose from all parts of France that it was almost impossible to find masters, as the few candidates who presented themselves were for the most part incapable of teaching, so that not many schools could be opened. This applies not only to the primary schools, but also to those known as the *écoles centrales*, or secondary schools, established also by the law of the 3d Brumaire for the purpose of replacing the universities and the colleges, which had been destroyed by the confiscation of their income. On the other hand, the masters who had refused to take the oath opened private schools, where religious instruction was given as of old. As the majority of parents sent their children to these schools, they were soon in a flourishing condition. Their prosperity excited the jealousy of their rivals, and denunciations of their Catholic and anti-republican spirit soon arose from the functionaries in all parts of France, together with demands for their suppression by the government. The Directory, in its anti-Christian fanaticism, undertook to do so. Although by the Constitution every citizen was granted liberty of education, the Directory by the decree of 27 Brumaire an VI. (17 November, 1797) enacted that no one should in future obtain any employment from the government who could not produce a certificate of having frequented the "*écoles centrales*." By another decree date 17 Pluviôse an VI. (5th February, 1798) they placed all schools and educational establishments under the supervision of the municipalities, which were obliged to visit them at least once a month at irregular intervals. They were to ascertain if the masters had provided their pupils with the "Rights of Man" and the other elementary works recommended by the Convention, and also if they observed the *décadis* by closing their schools and assisting at the feasts instituted by the Republic. If the teachers disobeyed, the administration was empowered to suppress the school without having recourse to a court of law, and to prohibit the masters and mistresses from opening another.¹⁸ The archives of the provincial towns have furnished an abundant harvest of documents which show that as a general rule the municipalities did not fail to make use of the despotic power with which they had been invested and to close every school where the teachers failed in any way to submit to the anti-Christian legislation of the Directory. In many places the schoolmaster, proscribed and hunted like the priest, was obliged to hold his classes secretly

¹⁸ L'Abbé Allain, L'Œuvre scolaire de la Révolution, pp. 104, 105. Victor Pierre, L'École sous la Révolution, p. 194.

in private houses, but the majority of parents, even at the risk of allowing their children to grow up in ignorance, still refused to send them to the schools where atheism was taught.

It is not surprising that the Commissioners sent by the First Consul in 1801 to investigate the state of France found education everywhere in a deplorable condition. In the *écoles centrales* the courses of literature, history and law were deserted; those of science were followed by a few pupils, but in many cases only the drawing classes were frequented.¹⁹ Only a few of the primary schools which the numerous decrees of the Convention had ordered to be established had been opened. Many of the masters of these schools had forfeited the confidence of the people by their drunkenness and immorality, and the parents preferred to send their children to private schools, where they found better teaching, a higher degree of morality and religious instruction.²⁰

These reports from all parts of France agree in showing that the priests who had taken the oath imposed by the *Constitution Civile du Clergé*, and who formed the schismatical church, were avoided by nearly the entire population. Barbé-Marbois thus relates his experiences: "At Vannes, on Twelfth Day, I entered the Cathedral, where the Constitutional Mass was being celebrated. There were there only the priest and two or three poor persons. Some distance away I found such a great crowd in the street that it was impossible to pass. They were people who had not been able to enter a chapel, which was already full, and where a Mass, which they call the Catholic Mass, was being said. Elsewhere the churches in the towns were in a like manner deserted, and the people went by execrable roads to neighboring villages to hear the Mass of a priest lately returned from England."²¹ Even in Paris and the adjacent departments the Commissioner reports that the churches which were the most frequented were those which were served by priests who had not taken any oath or who had retracted.²² This attachment to the Catholic Church which, in spite of ten years of a sanguinary persecution, the French people still manifested, did not fail to convince the Commissioners of the impossibility of destroying religion in France, and their reports must have strengthened Bonaparte's determination to effect a reconciliation with Rome. Fourcroy, who

¹⁹ Rocquain, p. 28. *Rapport de Français de Nantes.*

²⁰ *Id.*, p. 194. *Rapport de Fourcroy.*

²¹ *Id.*, p. 101. *Rapport de Barbé-Marbois.* The origin of the *Constitution Civile du Clergé* has been described in the paper on Pius VI. and the French Revolution published in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXXI, October, 1906.

²² *Id.*, p. 275. *Rapport du Général Lacnée de sa mission dans la 11ere division militaire.* It composed the departments of l'Aisne, Eure-et-Loir, Loiret, l'Oise, Seine, Seine-et-Marne, Seine-et-Oise.

visited the western departments, which had been the scene of the heroic resistance of the Vendéans, was especially struck by this fidelity. He confesses that "that war had given modern governments a great lesson which the pretensions of the philosophers vainly sought to nullify." He asserts "that the people should be allowed to keep their priests, their altars and their religion, for it was evident that the great mass of the French wished to return to their ancient customs, and this national tendency could no longer be resisted."

In most of these reports is described the satisfaction generally felt by all classes at the establishment of a government which could maintain order. In some places the Jacobins regretted the loss of their power and hoped to regain it; they were, therefore, still dreaded, for they were armed, their plans were formed and they were ready to attack. On the other hand, the partisans of order were without energy, without unity, without resources and trusted that the government would protect them. The great majority of the citizens, indeed, were satisfied with the actual state of affairs, but many of the royalists, of the clergy and of the returned *émigrés* still hoped for the eventual triumph of their cause and conspired in secret, without, however, intending to take arms.²³ The people, however, which had seen every party proscribed in its turn, felt the advantage of having a strong government, and considered that the loss of the First Consul would be one of the greatest misfortunes which could happen to France, while all those who had taken an active share in the Revolution dreaded the return to power of the particular faction against which they had fought.

The proscriptions, the confiscations and the disturbances, amounting sometimes to civil war, which had existed in France since the beginning of the Republic had produced great misery throughout the country. Almost all trade with the French colonies and with foreign countries had ceased, for the English fleets held the sea, 25,000 French sailors were prisoners of war in England and from 7,000 to 8,000 others were serving on board English ships.²⁴ Manufactures which had been in a flourishing condition before the Revolution had either ceased to exist or had shrunk to much smaller dimensions. Since the fall of the Directory, however, there had been a marked improvement, and if the war were to cease great activity might be expected.

In many places the local governments were completely disorganized and their finances were in the utmost confusion. There was great injustice in the levy of the land tax, as owing to the connivance

²³ *Id.*, p. 248, p. 252, p. 288. *Rapport du Général Lacnéé.*

²⁴ *Id.*, p. 112. *Rapport de Barbé-Marbois.*

of the municipalities some lands paid more than their share, while others paid nothing. The taxgatherers' books were carelessly kept. Barbé-Marbois did not find a single accountant able to present his accounts. The generals in command of the departments frequently seized the money in the treasuries of the departments, but they left the pay of the troops in arrears, while the Justices of the Peace, some of whom were workmen who could not sign their name, the official schoolmasters and a very large number of the smaller functionaries were not paid their salaries by the government.²⁵ At the time, therefore, of the fall of the Directory France seemed as though it had been devastated and plundered by a foreign army, although the various groups of politicians who since ten years had in turn ruled the State had not only seized all the wealth of France in the name of the nation, but had also levied enormous contributions on many continental countries.²⁶

It is not, therefore, surprising that the majority of the French nation should have been ready to acquiesce in the seizure of the supreme power by the only man who seemed capable of restoring peace and good government in France. The chief merit of Bonaparte was that, although he had served the Jacobins, he had not adopted their fanatical hatred of religion, but that he saw clearly how general was the attachment to the Church in France, and that to pacify the country and raise it out of its demoralized condition it was necessary to grant religious liberty, to suppress the schismati-

²⁵ *Id.*, p. 59. *Rapport de François de Nantes*, p. 75, p. 97. *Rapport de Barbé-Marbois*.

²⁶ Ludovic Scivot, *Le Directoire*. Paris, 1897, t. IV., p. 601. It has been calculated that the value of the lands of the crown, of the Church, of the nobles who had emigrated, of all the corporations and associations which were confiscated and sold amounted to five thousand millions and a half of livres (at least a thousand millions and a hundred thousand dollars). To this must be added the crown diamonds and the Church plate, together with that of the royal palaces and of the châteaux of the aristocracy, amounting at least to two hundred and fifty millions of livres (roughly, fifty millions of dollars). The war contributions were levied especially by the Convention and the Directory. Those paid by Belgium have been estimated at 180,000,000 of livres. Holland paid 200,000,000 livres. Germany—Franconia, 12,000,000; Wurtemberg, 6,000,000; Baden, 3,000,000; Suabia, 20,000,000; Frankfort, 12,000,000; total, 53,000,000 livres. Italy—Pius VI. and the Roman Republic, 74,000,000; Modena, 10,000,000; Parma, 3,000,000; Tuscany, 3,000,000; the port of Leghorn, 5,000,000; Piedmont, 4,000,000; the Cisalpine Republic, 70,000,000; the port of Trieste, 3,000,000; Verona, 4,000,000; Venice, 6,000,000; *idem*, provisions, etc., 4,000,000; Mantua, 2,000,000; total, 188,000,000 livres. Switzerland, 28,500,000 livres—a grand total of 649,500,000 livres, about \$129,900,000. All this was paid to the Government of the French Republic, as well as the plunder of the *Monts-de-piété*, or State pawn offices of the great towns of Italy, the treasuries of the hospitals, the plate of the churches. It does not comprise the contributions extorted by the generals, the plunder of the churches, of the monasteries, of the palaces and villas of the nobles or of the farms of the peasantry.

cal clergy and to effect a reconciliation with Rome. On the other hand, though he indeed wished to reëstablish the Church, he wished it to be not only Catholic, and, therefore, acceptable to the people, but that it should also renounce its attachment to the monarchy and submit to the new institutions, or at least not be hostile to them. This could only be brought about by the intervention of the Pope, but Bonaparte hoped to carry out his plans in such a manner that eventually the French Church should depend as much as possible on the State and as little as possible on Rome, without, however, going so far as a schism.²⁷

But if Bonaparte saw the necessity of making some concessions to the Church by granting liberty of worship and by the official recognition of the Holy Father as its head, the constitutional clergy, who had sought to bring about a schism, and the unbelievers, who for ten years had labored for the destruction of Christianity, now made every effort to hinder the completion of the Concordat. Chief among these opponents, according to Mgr. Spina, was Talleyrand, the ex-Bishop of Autun and Minister for Foreign Affairs, without whose assistance the others could effect but little. He "displayed more and more his opposition to the restoration of religion, as he foresaw that it would give greater prominence to his past errors, which he is not at all disposed to retract."²⁸

The revised text of the Concordat, which had been sent to Rome for the approval of the Holy Father, reached Paris on May 23. At Mgr. Spina's request the Abbé Bernier presented it to Bonaparte personally at Malmaison on the following day, "before any one could inspire him with prejudices against it and furnish him with fresh suggestions." The three Consuls professed to be very well pleased with the document, and Bonaparte remarked that with the exception of a few expressions which might be easily corrected it was quite satisfactory. After the lapse, however, of a few days a complete

²⁷ Albert Vandal, *Les Raisons du Concordat*. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Février, 1907, p. 518. M. Vandal quotes a speech made by the First Consul in February, 1801, to several members of the Thibunat (an assembly of one hundred members elected by the Senate for the discussion of bills). It was taken down by Lagarde, the secretary to the Consuls, and is unedited. Bonaparte expressed his views very frankly. He pointed out that the majority of the French people was attached to the Catholic religion, and as the people were sovereign, he could not be blamed if he respected public opinion. The Pope alone could reorganize the Catholics of France under the Republican Government without bloodshed and without violence. The foreign intermediary could be suppressed after he had reconciled the Republic and the ecclesiastics, and the direction of the latter would remain entirely in the hands of the Government.

²⁸ Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat de 1801*. Paris, 1891-1905, t. III., p. 43, No. 552. Spina à Consalvi, Paris, 5 Giugno, 1801.

change took place in the opinions of the government, for Talleyrand had presented his official report on the new draft, in which he objected to the modifications which had been made in Rome. He found fault with the clause which demanded the repeal of the decrees contrary to the dogmas and discipline of the Church and blamed the omission of that which related to the priests who had married. In his letter to the Abbé Bernier, intended to be communicated to Mgr. Spina, he adopted a more imperious and insolent tone and accused the Holy See of aiming only at gaining time by obstructing and impeding the negotiations by vain quibbles and frivolous subtleties.

When Talleyrand learned that Cardinal Consalvi had left Rome and was on his way to Paris he would seem to have dreaded the effect which the well-known personal influence of the Pope's Prime Minister might produce on Bonaparte, for he ordered the Abbé Bernier to prepare a sixth project for a Concordat and to persuade Mgr. Spina to sign it, so that the Cardinal on his arrival should find the matter already concluded. But though Mgr. Spina had been, a short time previously, invested with full powers, he refused to affix his name to this document, which, as he stated in his reply to Bernier, differed completely from that which had been sent by the Holy Father, as it "omitted the matters which constituted the very foundations of the Concordat and whatever else might induce the Holy Father to ratify it by an Apostolic Bull."²⁹

Cardinal Consalvi arrived in Paris on the night of 20th June, 1801. Bonaparte, to whom he applied for an audience, fixed the following day for it and asked him to come "dressed as much like a Cardinal as possible." He wore, therefore, the black coat, red stockings, skull cap and the tasselled hat usually worn by Cardinals in Rome when, on the afternoon of the 21st, he was brought to the Tuileries in the carriage of the Master of the Ceremonies. The First Consul had already begun to surround himself with much of the pomp of a sovereign, and had revived many of the dignities of the ancient court. The Cardinal was at first introduced into a room on the ground floor (*le salon des ambassadeurs*) to wait until his arrival was announced. He was then led through a small door opening on to the great staircase of the palace, and, to his great surprise, for he did not expect to be received in public and he was not aware that a reception of civil and military functionaries was held at the palace every fortnight, he found himself in the midst of a crowd of people wearing splendid uniforms and was received with military honors by the troops which lined the staircase and the State apartments. In the last ante-chamber he was met by Talleyrand,

²⁹ *Id.*, t. III., p. 62, No. 565. Spina à Bernier, 16 Juin.

the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who brought him not into the First Consul's private study, as he supposed, but into a vast hall filled with a multitude of persons theatrically arranged. In the background were drawn up the members of the Senate, of the Tribunate, of the Legislative Body and of the High Courts of Justice. Along the sides were generals and officers of every rank, Ministers and other servants of the State, and in front, standing out from the brilliant assemblage, the three Consuls. Bonaparte advanced a few steps to meet the Cardinal, who was presented to him by Talleyrand, and before Consalvi was able to speak he addressed him in a curt manner ("d'un ton bref") : "I know the reason for your journey to France. I desire that the conferences should begin immediately. I allow you five days, and I warn you that if at the expiration of the fifth day the negotiations are not concluded, you must return to Rome, as in that case I have already made up my mind what to do."³⁰

The interview lasted not less than three-quarters of an hour, during which Bonaparte spoke in a low voice so as to be heard only by Consalvi and by Talleyrand, who stood beside him. As the audience proceeded his countenance and his language became more friendly and courteous, and he discussed a variety of matters with much volubility and impetuosity, but without anger or harshness. He spoke of the Holy Father with much veneration and expressed the highest opinion of him, though he showed that he still entertained the suspicions he had so often manifested with regard to the conduct of the Court of Rome during the negotiations. The Pope's friendly relations with a non-Catholic power like Russia and his reestablishment of the Jesuits in Russia at the request of the Emperor Paul I. were the principal motives for his displeasure. As for the new project for a Concordat which should be presented, it would contain some slight variations from that which had been sent to Rome and would represent all that he could concede. In his reply the Cardinal stated that the chief reason for his mission was to prove the falsity of the accusations which had been made against the Court of Rome and the non-existence of the political views which were supposed to have caused the changes in the project of the Concordat and the delay in sending it back. He was authorized, he said, to make some alterations in the wording of the Roman document, provided the substance was not changed; otherwise he should

³⁰ Mémoirs du Cardinal Consalvi, avec une Introduction et des Notes par J. Crétineau-Joly. Paris, 1864, t. I., p. 332; and Documents, etc., t. III., p. 112, No. 601, Consalvi à Doria. Parigi, 23d Giugno, 1801. These are the sources from which the description of this interview is taken. The Mémoirs, written in 1811-1812, give more details than the official letter to Cardinal Doria, but the main features are substantially the same.

be obliged to submit the new version to the Holy Father. Bonaparte answered that the most urgent reasons forbade him to grant the shortest delay, and that the new project should be signed on the fifth day, or he would break off the negotiations and institute a national religion. He asserted that he had the means of doing so, and that he was sure of success. In a last appeal Consalvi expressed his confidence that the First Consul's wisdom and sense of justice would make him propose changes that could be accepted or that a short delay might be granted; but Bonaparte repeated that he should certainly grant no delay, and then, with a slight bow, he returned to his place between the two other Consuls and the audience came to an end.

Within a few days the indefatigable Abbé Bernier produced another draft for a Concordat; it was the seventh. Consalvi had pointed out to him his objections to that which had been presented to Mgr. Spina. It contained no positive guarantee that the exercise of the Catholic religion should be free and public and that all decrees to the contrary should be abolished. The First Consul had been granted the right of nominating the Bishops, but it had not been specified that he should be a Catholic, or, if not, that another mode of nomination should be adopted which should not prejudice the rights of the State or of the Church. Another matter of which he disapproved was that the Bishops could not make a new circumscription of parishes or appoint parish priests without the "approbation of the government."

In spite of Bonaparte's threat that he would break off the negotiations unless they were concluded within five days, it was only on June 26 that this seventh draft was presented. On the same day Consalvi dined with Talleyrand, who informed him that neither he nor the First Consul could accept the smallest variation in this document and insisted on having a decided answer on the following day. The Papal representatives worked all night and drew up another version of the project, to which Consalvi added a long memorandum giving the reasons for their refusal to accept that just furnished by Bernier. This last draft showed, in fact, a less conciliatory spirit than the sixth. It contained articles already rejected by Rome, and not only changed many expressions, but made such variations in its substance by omitting or adding various matters, that the Cardinal's powers could not authorize him to sign it.³¹ In the counter project which the Cardinal drew up he again sought to insert stipulations which had been considered in Rome as of vital importance in any

³¹ Documents, III., p. 153, No. 619. Consalvi à Doria, 2 Luglio. "E'rincarito di quello presentato a Mgr. Spina." . . . "I miei poteri non mi permettevano di sottoscriverlo."

treaty for the reëstablishment of the Catholic religion in France. He introduced into the preamble the statement that the members of the French Government professed the Catholic religion, at least in their private capacity. He demanded that the Catholic religion should enjoy freedom and publicity and that the obstacles which hindered its exercise should be abolished. The article which stipulated that the Holy Father should oblige the French Bishops to resign their sees had been harshly worded; Consalvi gave it a more courteous form less likely to wound their feelings. He modified the form of the oath to be sworn by the new prelates and consented that they should swear obedience and fidelity to the government and to the authorities established by the Constitution instead of submission to the civil and political laws of the Republic. The Cardinal again refused to subject the new circumscription of the parishes and the nomination of the parish priests to the approbation of the government, but agreed that in the former case the government might "act in concert" with the Bishops, and in the latter that the candidates should be persons who had not "forfeited the confidence of the government" (*qui n'auront pas démerité la confiance du gouvernement*). The article which required the Holy Father to "renounce, in the name of the Church, all pretensions to the ecclesiastical domains which had been alienated" seemed to imply that the Sovereign Pontiff consented to the sale. Consalvi substituted for it a promise that the "purchasers of these lands should not be disturbed in their possession," which expressed no approbation of what had taken place.

The Cardinal's labors were, unfortunately, thrown away. Talleyrand, who was about to leave Paris for the baths of Bourbon-l'Archambault, wrote on the margin of the draft that it gave a retrograde character to the negotiations and that his opposition proceeded from a spirit of chicanery and shuffling ("un esprit de chicane et de tracasserie"), which should be put an end to. Consalvi since his arrival in Paris had made every possible concession to the demands of the French Government, for he saw clearly that there were points on which the Executive did not dare to oppose public opinion. He assured Cardinal Doria that "it was necessary to be in Paris to understand the state of affairs. . . . Since one or two months matters had become much worse. The war which had broken out against reunion with Rome was incredible. The magistrates of all ranks, the philosophers, those who lead licentious lives, the greater part of the army are most hostile to it. The First Consul has been told to his face that if he wishes to put an end to the Republic and bring back monarchy, the reunion with Rome is the surest method. Bonaparte is terrified. He is the only person who

really desires this reunion ; but, being alarmed by the general opposition, fearing to enter into a struggle and also to be ridiculed by the philosophers, he has placed the affair in the hands of many persons to interest them all in it, and thus not to be the only one to bear the responsibility.”³²

Talleyrand’s departure from Paris relieved Cardinal Consalvi to a certain degree from the danger of his hostile influence, and on July 3 the Abbé Bernier obtained for him an interview with Bonaparte at *la Malmaison*, where he met with a friendly reception. The Concordat was discussed. Bonaparte refused to allow the insertion in it of any formal declaration that either he or the other Consuls professed the Catholic religion, on the ground that, as they had never abjured Catholicity and were neither heretics nor atheists, it should be taken for granted that they were Catholics. It would be a folly, he asserted, to entertain a fear that at any future time there might be non-Catholic Consuls. He refused also to allow the publicity of worship to be formally guaranteed, and assured that little by little it should be granted, but that it would be impossible to do so at that moment. When Cardinal Consalvi called his attention to the so-called national council that the Bishops and clergy of the schismatic Constitutional Church had been allowed to hold in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Bonaparte coolly replied that as long as he was not sure how he stood with Rome he could not act otherwise.³³ He refused to allow Consalvi time to refer to the Holy Father with regard to the various changes which had been introduced into the draft of the Concordat, but yielded so far as to consent to his holding another conference with the Abbé Bernier, in which they might come to a final decision.

The interview took place on the following day. The negotiators

³² Documents, t. III., p. 149, No. 618, and p. 159, No. 620. Consalvi à Doria, 2 luglio.

³³ Documents, t. III., p. 180, No. 629. Count Cobenzel to Colloredo, Paris, 8 Juillet, 1801. The council was opened by a most violent attack against the Pope, pronounced by Grégoire, the schismatic Bishop of Blois: “The object of the assembly is to make a schism and to detach the French Church completely from the authority of the Holy See. As Grégoire’s conduct is at least tolerated by the Government, it is evident that, on one hand, it is meant to be used as a menace (épouvantail) to render the Cardinal more supple in the matters about which he is treating, and, on the other, to prepare the way for the measures to be taken in case no agreement can be made with the Holy See.” Count Cobenzel frequently assured the Cardinal that if Bonaparte broke definitively with Rome the evils which would be the result would not be limited to France. As he would wish to have accomplices in his revolt, in order to diminish the horror of it in the eyes of the people, he had often said that he would impose his will on other governments, and drag after him Germany, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Holland and every country where his power was already unlimited and irresistible. Consalvi, *Mémoirs*, t. I., p. 340.

came to an agreement on some of the fundamental propositions, and Consalvi began to hope that the government might accept the new forms which had been given to some of the articles. One thing was certain, that "the First Consul wished to conclude the Concordat, but without giving offense to anybody, which was almost impossible on account of the great number of powerful enemies who were opposed to it."³⁴ Bonaparte's answer to this revision, which had cost Consalvi so much anxious thought, came on the 7th. The declaration that the government was Catholic and the publicity to be granted to the Catholic religion, which the Holy Father considered to be of such importance, were also the points on which the First Consul, probably from the dread of offending the Jacobins, was least inclined to yield. He therefore refused to accept the declaration that the members of the government were Catholic, but consented to allow it to be used with regard to himself ("le Premier Consul actuel"). He objected to the words "the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion shall be freely and publicly practiced in France," as that might imply granting an indefinite extension of out-of-door religious ceremonies, which at that time, in certain parts of France, might provoke insults and give rise to disturbances. He also asked that the form of oath to be taken by the French Bishops should be the same as that by which their predecessors used to swear allegiance to the Kings of France, a demand which would seem to indicate that he had already resolved to ascend the throne.

Further concessions were then made on both sides, into the details of which it would be too tedious to enter, but the Cardinal persisted in demanding that the Catholic religion should be "freely and publicly" practiced without any restriction. As, however, he understood that to guard religion from insult and to preserve the peace the government might for a time object to the celebration of religious ceremonies outside the churches, he offered to procure a brief in which the Holy Father, after praising Bonaparte for the restoration of religion, would add that, as there was no desire to expose religion to insult and disturb public tranquillity, it was well that the government should take steps to guard against such dangers. This would sanction the temporary intervention of the government in ecclesiastical matters without acknowledging it formally as a right by an article in a treaty.³⁵ Consalvi raised also some objections to the change in the form of oath to be taken by the Bishops, for it had been originally suggested by the government, and had been approved of by the Pope.

³⁴ Documents, III., p. 158, No. 620. Consalvi à Doria, 3 Luglio.

³⁵ *Id.*, III., p. 226, No. 647, and p. 239, No. 648. Consalvi à Doria, 16 Luglio, 1801.

Bonaparte and one of his colleagues were at first, however, pleased with the offer of the brief, but Cambacérès, the Second Consul, maintained so strongly that the Pope ought not to be allowed to exercise any authority, even indirectly, in matters which concerned the government, that he drove Bonaparte into a furious fit of anger. He rejected the brief, but consented to allow the word "publicly" to be employed, with the addition of the words "while conforming to the police regulations which the government shall judge necessary to enact." Bernier was ordered to inform Consalvi that within twenty-four hours he should say if he would accept the articles relating to the oath and to the publicity of worship, yes or no. If he refused, the negotiations would cease and there would be a decided rupture. Bernier was, however, to add that the government did not intend to claim any new right or to hinder the exterior exercise of religion, but that it was obliged to yield to necessity, and that when happier times should enable it to surround religion everywhere with all the splendor it deserves, it would be happy to seize the opportunity.³⁶

Cardinal Consalvi consented to allow the ancient form of oath to be adopted, and in an interview with Bernier, trusting to his assurances that the police regulations would be merely such as the circumstances of the time might demand, he changed the article in question by dividing it into three clauses: "The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion shall be freely exercised in France. The government shall remove all the obstacles which might impede it. Its worship shall be public, while conforming, on account of the present circumstances, to the police regulations which shall be judged necessary."³⁷ As this answer seemed to have fully conceded the two points which had remained undecided, Consalvi could at last inform Bernier that both he and Mgr. Spina were ready to sign the Concordat, subject, however, to its ratification by the Holy Father. Bernier forwarded the document to the First Consul, who by a decree delegated his brother, Joseph Bonaparte, a Councillor of State named Cretet and the Abbé Bernier to sign it on the part of the Republic, and on July 13 a few lines in the *Moniteur* announced that "Cardinal Consalvi has succeeded in the mission to the government with which he was charged by the Holy Father."

A note from the Abbé Bernier announced to Consalvi on the morning of the 13th the names of the plenipotentiaries whom he was to meet. By another in the afternoon the abbé informed him that he would call for him at 7 to bring him to the house of Joseph Bona-

³⁶ Documents, t. VI., p. 90, No. 630 ter. Bernier à Consalvi, 11 Juillet.

³⁷ Documents, III., p. 240, No. 648. Eclaircissements de Consalvi sur la Convention signée la 15 Juillet, 1801. Cardinal Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801. Ses Origines—son Histoire.* Paris, 1903, p. 242.

parte, and to the Cardinal's great astonishment enclosed a new draft of the Concordat which should then be presented for his signature, assuring him, however, that he would have to deal with just and reasonable men, and that all would end well.⁸⁸ In this new draft, so unexpectedly presented to him at the last moment, apparently in the hope that, being thus taken by surprise, he would offer less resistance, the chief concessions made by the government in previous drafts were revoked. There was no declaration with regard to the religious belief of the Consuls; the publicity of religious ceremonies was subjected to the police regulations which the government should judge necessary; the Bishops were not authorized to have a chapter in their cathedral or a seminary in their diocese. Consalvi had wished that the measures to be adopted with regard to the priests who had married should not be inserted in the Concordat, for it was purely a matter of conscience, and the publicity which would be given to it by a document of such importance would only increase the scandal.⁸⁹ They would be dealt with by a special brief, according to the rules established for such cases. In this new version of the Concordat, however, these members of the clergy, as well as those who had openly renounced the ecclesiastical state, were made the subject of a special article. In the reply which Consalvi immediately forwarded to Bernier he expressed very forcibly his surprise at this unexpected change almost at the moment of signature in the articles which had been discussed and agreed upon and all the words of which had been so carefully studied that they could not be changed. When Bernier came at the hour he had appointed he renewed the assurances which he had already given that all would turn out well; but Consalvi again expressed his opinion of the way in which he had been treated and showed that he had but faint hopes of a successful issue.

This sudden change in the text of a document which in the course of several months had been so often remodeled and amended and was considered to have been at last rendered acceptable to both the contracting parties is believed to have been owing to Talleyrand. His representative, de Flauterive, faithful to the ideas of his superior, presented to the First Consul on the morning of July 13 a report in

⁸⁸ The Abbé Bernier's second note: "Eminence, I warn you that the conference will be held at the house of Citizen Joseph Bonaparte this evening at 8 o'clock. I shall come for you at seven. Here is what will be first proposed to you; read it carefully; examine everything; do not despair of anything. I have just had a long conference with Joseph and Cretet. You have to deal with just and reasonable men. All will end well this evening. I offer you my profound respect.—Bernier." Documents, t. VI., p. 94, No. 642 bis. Bernier à Consalvi, 13 Juillet, 1801.

⁸⁹ Documents, Vi., p. 71, No. 610 quater. Consalvi à Bernier, 27 Giugno, and p. 81, No. 620 ter., Consalvi à Bernier, 4 Juillet. Cardinal Mathieu, p. 249.

which he criticized the draft which had been just furnished by Consalvi. He blamed especially the omission of the article which referred to the steps to be taken with regard to the priests who had abandoned the ecclesiastical state, a point to which Talleyrand attached much importance.⁴⁰

Before going further it may be well to relate a strange misunderstanding which existed for many years with regard to what took place at the signature of the Concordat. The circumstances which accompanied this event had remained unknown until the publication in 1864 of a translation of the Memoirs of Cardinal Consalvi by J. Crétineau-Joly. These *Mémoires* were written in 1812, while the Cardinal was in exile at Rheims. They were composed, as he observes, without the aid of any notes or documents which might assist his memory, and in case, therefore, they should differ in anything from the despatches which he had forwarded at the time to the Holy See, he requests the reader to give the preference to the official documents.⁴¹

In this account the Cardinal does not mention the second note which he had received from Bernier on the 13th along with the new draft. He states that when he and the other Papal Envoys had been introduced to Joseph Bonaparte, and that the order in which they were to place their signatures had been settled, the Abbé Bernier unrolled and presented to him the copy of the Concordat which was to be signed. Casting his eyes over it, he perceived that it was not the document which had been agreed upon, but something quite different, and on examining it more carefully he found in it all those deviations from the approved text which have just been mentioned. To the surprise and indignation which he manifested at such a proceeding, Joseph Bonaparte replied that he knew nothing about the discussions which had taken place, and that he had thought he had nothing to do but to sign, while Bernier, embarrassed and confused, avowed that he was well aware of the difference between the two documents, but that the First Consul had so willed it and had declared to him that it was allowable to make changes in a treaty so long as no signature had been given.

The publication of this strange story, which represented Bonaparte as capable of the lowest trickery in order to attain his ends, caused great excitement in France, and the historians and literary men of the day were divided into two camps, according as their political opinions rendered them partisans or enemies of the Bonapartes. As a reply the Oratorian Father Theiner, Prefect of the Vatican archives, published in 1869, in a work entitled "*Les deux Con-*

⁴⁰ Documents, t. III, p. 199, No. 639. Rapport rédigé par d'Hauterive, 13 Juillet, 1801. Cardinal Mathieu, p. 250.

⁴¹ Cardinal Consalvi, *Mémoires*, t. I., p. 414; t. II., 221.

cordats," Consalvi's letter to Cardinal Doria of July 16, in which he mentions the two notes and the amended version of the Concordat which he had received from Bernier on the 13th. The account of the event given in the *Mémoires* was thus proved to be erroneous, although Theiner was unable to find any trace of the two notes. They were not discovered until November, 1899, when they were found by Mgr. Wenzel, sub-prefect of the secret archives of the Vatican, among other papers which had been stored in a summer house in the gardens of the palace.⁴² In this case at least the authentic relation of what took place when the Concordat was signed is to be found in the official correspondence, and not in the *Mémoires*. After the lapse of twelve years the Cardinal had apparently forgotten the exact sequence of events, but the fact remains that only a few hours before the signature of the Concordat a document totally different from that which had been agreed upon was forwarded to the Cardinal, with the intimation that he would be expected to sign it. He may have hoped that after his reply to Bernier it would have been withdrawn, and, on finding it again put forward, he must have expressed very strongly to Bonaparte's delegates what he thought of this unscrupulous attempt to extort his signature.

That morning Joseph Bonaparte and Cretet had received from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs two copies of the Concordat. One, furnished by Bernier, was probably that which had been agreed upon between him and Consalvi; the other was that which the government proposed in its stead.⁴³ Bernier had also had a long conference with them, so that though they had not until then taken any share in the negotiations, they did not come to the interview unprepared. It was with great reluctance, and solely on account of the entreaties of Joseph Bonaparte, who, according to Consalvi, acted throughout with prudence and good will, that the Cardinal consented to undertake to discuss once more the articles of the Concordat one by one. This discussion, which was based on the text adopted by the government, lasted for twenty hours and was interrupted only by a light collation. The Papal Envoys were many

⁴² Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents, etc.*, VI., p. 6. Card. Mathieu, p. 246. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 18 November, 1899, p. 421. These notes were found in a collection of documents which had been printed for the use of the Cardinals who were consulted by the Pope with regard to the ratification of the Concordat. Its title was "Esame del Trattato di Convenzione tra la Santa Sede e et Governo Francese sottoscritto dai respectivi Plenipotenziari a Parigi il 15 Luglio, 1801."

⁴³ *Documents*, t. III., p. 199, No. 637. Maret (Secretary of State) à Caillard (Secretary for Foreign Affairs during Talleyrand's absence), 12 Juillet, 1801. "Je vous envoie en même temps, deux projets de Convention sur les affaires ecclesiastiques. L'un, côté A, a été remis par le citoyen Bernier. . . . L'autre, côté B, est la rédaction définitive adoptée par le gouvernement. Il n'y a entre l'une et l'autre aucune différence essentielle."

times on the point of bringing it to a close and of breaking off the negotiations, but Consalvi by his tact and his skillful diplomacy succeeded in obtaining several important concessions. The Catholicity of the Consuls was acknowledged in the preamble. The obstacles to the free exercise of the Catholic religion were to be abolished. Worship was to be public, but in conformity to the police regulations which the circumstances of that time might render necessary. The article relating to the married priests was withdrawn. The existence of chapters and seminaries was again granted and the Bishops were not obliged to name their parish priests "with the approbation of the government," but to ascertain that they were "gifted with the qualities required by the laws of the Church, and that they possessed the confidence of the government."

When at last the plenipotentiaries were agreed upon all points, Consalvi tried to have the treaty signed at once, as he feared that any delay might afford an opportunity for bringing forward new objections and further demands. Joseph Bonaparte and Cretet, however, refused to incur such a responsibility without previously obtaining the approbation of the First Consul, for they felt that on many points they had deviated from what he had laid down, and they therefore brought the document at once to the Tuileries. Bonaparte on receiving the draft gave way to one of his outbursts of fury and flung the paper into the fire.⁴⁴ It was especially the changes made in the articles relating to the publicity of divine worship and to the nomination of parish priests which excited his indignation to such a degree. He insisted that the expressions which he had employed in those articles should be preserved without any change, and he ordered his brother to inform the Papal Envoys that if they refused to sign the draft which he had drawn up they might leave at once, and that whatever results might follow would be their fault, and not his. To this message Consalvi could only reply by a positive refusal, and thus the arduous labors of so many weary hours came to nothing; but before separating the negotiators agreed to meet again on the following day so as to allow the French representatives to make, as they said, another attempt at persuasion.⁴⁵

That evening, July 14, the national feast in honor of the taking of the Bastille was to be celebrated at the Tuileries by a banquet of 250 guests, at which Bonaparte had intended to announce that the Concordat had been signed. The Envoys of Pius VII. had been

⁴⁴ Though it was July 14, the weather was so cold that there were still fires. Documents, III., p. 231, No. 647. Consalvi à Doria, 16 Luglio, 1801.

⁴⁵ Documents, III., p. 232, No. 647. Consalvi à Doria, 16 Luglio, 1801, and p. 243, No. 648. Éclaircissements de Consalvi sur la Convention signée le 15 Juillet.

invited, and it is easy to imagine with what a feeling of apprehension Consalvi went to meet the First Consul, still laboring under the intense irritation caused by the failure of an undertaking to which he attached so much importance. The reception room of the palace was filled with a brilliant crowd of officers, magistrates, dignitaries of state and foreign ministers. When the Cardinal appeared in it Bonaparte, on seeing him, cried out in a loud and scornful voice, his countenance enflamed with anger: "Well, Cardinal, you have wished to break off! So be it. I do not want Rome. I shall act by myself. I do not want the Pope. If Henry VIII., who had not the twentieth part of my power, knew how to change the religion of his country, and succeeded in doing so, it will be much easier for me to know how to do it and to be able to do it. By changing religion in France I shall change it in nearly the whole of Europe, wherever the influence of my power extends. Rome shall perceive her loss and weep over it, but it will be too late. You may go, as there is nothing more to be done. You have wished to break off, so let it be, since you have wished it." To this public outburst of fury, uttered in a loud and angry tone, the Cardinal replied that he could not go beyond his powers nor give way with regard to matters which were contrary to the principles professed by the Holy See. He also observed that the Papal representatives could not be accused of having provoked the rupture, since they had agreed to all the clauses save one, about which they had offered to consult the Holy Father himself. Here Bonaparte interrupted him, saying that he did not wish to leave anything unfinished, and that he would decide on the whole or on nothing.⁴⁶ The Cardinal again declared that he had not the power to sign the article in question as it then stood, and Bonaparte wound up by saying that therefore he considered the affair ended, and that Rome would find it out and would weep tears of blood.

Count Cobenzel, the Austrian Ambassador, was standing close by. Bonaparte turned round towards him with great animation and repeated many times that he would change the religion of all the States of Europe; that no one would have the strength to resist him; that he would certainly not be the only one to do without the Church of Rome, and, finally, that he would set Europe on fire from one end to the other, and that on the Pope would fall the responsibility and also the punishment for it. He then went off hastily among the

⁴⁶ This suggestion that a certain article should be provisionally omitted from the Concordat and referred to the Holy Father is not to be found in Consalvi's official correspondence with Cardinal Doria, but only in his *Mémoires*, t. I., pp. 366, 372, 378. It was the article relating to publicity of worship, which Pius VII. considered to be of the greatest importance to secure, and not to leave to the arbitrary will of the Government.

other guests, to whom he repeated the same remarks. Count Cobenzel, who was much alarmed by this violent scene, tried to persuade Consalvi to find some way of avoiding a calamity which might entail such fatal consequences for religion throughout Europe; but the Cardinal could only reply that nothing could make him sign what he was not allowed to sign. The point in question was that on which Bonaparte most insisted and on which no agreement seemed possible—namely, the subjection of public worship to the police regulations which the government should judge necessary. Such, indeed, was the case in other Catholic countries, but Consalvi made the Ambassador understand the difference that lay between the toleration of an act of the government and the formal authorization of that act by a convention, as the First Consul demanded.⁴⁷

The discussion was renewed after dinner, and Cobenzel, an experienced diplomatist, succeeded by his tact and his courtesy in overcoming Bonaparte's obstinacy so far as to persuade him to allow the plenipotentiaries to meet once more and seek for some method of coming to an understanding. The conference was held at noon on the following day in Joseph Bonaparte's house and lasted till midnight. Several hours were employed in discussing the paragraph relating to the supervision of the police. The French Government dreaded the disturbances to which the outdoor practice of religious ceremonies might give rise and maintained that it was therefore necessary to impose some restrictions on this publicity. But at Rome it was feared that too much extension might be given to the words "in conformity," and that the State might take advantage of them to impose its will on the Church on all occasions unless the liberty and publicity of the Catholic religion were expressly stipulated. Consalvi therefore refused to authorize by the assent of the Holy See the subjection of the Church to the State, which might be the result of this obligation of "conforming to the police regulations which the government may judge necessary." As, however, the motive which the government alleged for the imposition of this restriction was the necessity of maintaining order,

⁴⁷ Consalvi, *Mémoires*, t. I., pp. 365, 369. Documents, t. III., p. 243, No. 648. *Éclaircissements de Consalvi*, etc. *Id.*, t. VI., p. 96, No. 659 bis. Cobenzel à Colloredo, 20 Juillet, 1801. In his letter to Cardinal Doria of July 16, Consalvi does not give this vivid picture of Bonaparte's indignation. He says, on the contrary: "He received me politely," and condenses into a few words the speech in which the First Consul expressed his irritation and his resolution not to yield, and ended thus: "Either this or nothing, and I shall know well how to decide." The Cardinal may have feared that his letter might be opened, for he warns Cardinal Doria that he had many reasons to fear the mishaps that even a private courier might meet with, and that he would give him full explanations by word of mouth as to the dangerous state of affairs. Count Cobenzel, however, in his letter to Count Colloredo, states that "bitter reproaches were made to the Cardinal in my presence when we met together at dinner at the First Consul's."

he suggested as a compromise the addition of the words "for public tranquillity," limiting thereby the intervention of the government to a specified case, and after a long resistance the French negotiators consented to accept them.

A few more variations of the text of the Concordat were agreed to, the most important being that which related to the nomination of parish priests by the Bishops. Bonaparte had with his own hand inserted in the draft that "the nominations should not be valid until they had been accepted by the government." It was this phrase, "written by such a hand," as Consalvi observes, that he had to combat, and it was only after "incredible efforts" and the "suggestion of several other formulas which were refused by the plenipotentiaries that, by the mercy of God, he was able to compose the sentence, "their choice can fall only on persons accepted by the government." By this means the approbation of the government did not follow the nomination of the parish priests, a demand which had been rejected by Rome.⁴⁸

Consalvi then made every effort to obtain that the Concordat should be immediately signed, as he feared that any delay might allow hostile influences to be brought to bear on the First Consul, whom he knew to be "the only person who wanted the agreement in good faith." All the others were indifferent or opposed to it. Joseph Bonaparte, however, was still so much under the impression of the angry scene with his brother on the previous day that he positively refused to expose himself to be again insulted, and declined to sign until he had seen the First Consul. He yielded at last to Consalvi's earnest supplications, and at midnight on July 15, 1801, the six plenipotentiaries signed the deed on which for more than a century were based the relations between the Church and the State in France. "We succeeded," thus Cardinal Consalvi wrote to Cardinal Doria, "by a special grace of the Lord, who wished to deliver His Church from inexpressible evils. If the treaty had not been concluded, let your Eminence believe that I do not exaggerate, everything might have been feared, not only for the State, but also for religion itself. Not alone in France, but also in Italy and wherever the French exercise any influence, they were ready to adopt the strongest measures."⁴⁹ The Cardinal adds that if it had not been for the happy coincidence of the feast of July 14, when the First Consul wished to announce the conclusion of the Concordat, and of the absence of a powerful adversary,⁵⁰ the final difficulties would not have been conquered nor such concessions obtained.

⁴⁸ Documents, III., p. 249, No. 648. *Éclaircissements de Consalvi, etc.*

⁴⁹ Documents, t. III., p. 258, No. 650. *Consalvi à Doria.*

⁵⁰ An allusion to Talleyrand, whose hostility towards the Concordat was so well known, that the Austrian Ambassador, Count Cobenzel, informed

With regard to the reception by Bonaparte of the treaty which had been thus concluded without his final sanction there exists the same discrepancy between Consalvi's official correspondence and his Memoirs as upon a previous occasion. In the former he merely states that Joseph Bonaparte told him that the First Consul was content ("il Primo Console è stato contento"), by which he was relieved from his anxiety. In the latter he gives a more detailed and a very different account of the event. "I learned from Joseph that the First Consul had been very much irritated by the article which had been corrected, which at first he refused to approve for any consideration. But in the end, owing to the entreaties and the prayers of his brother, owing, above all, to the very serious reflections which he suggested to him as to the consequences of a rupture, the First Consul, after a long meditation and a long silence, which later events have sufficiently explained, accepted it and ordered me to be informed."⁵¹

The very great importance of the conclusion of the Concordat, not only for the restoration of order in France, but also for the maintenance of peace throughout Europe, is proved by the fact that the foreign Ambassadors in Paris came to congratulate and to thank Cardinal Consalvi, as they believed that by its influence the preservation and the tranquillity of their respective States would be assured. They agreed in looking upon the conclusion of the treaty as a miraculous event, and especially as it was so much more advantageous than seemed possible in the existing state of affairs.

Those who had sought, as Mirabeau said, "to dechristianize" France, and who in pursuing their aims had drenched the land with blood, had at last been foiled in their endeavor, but though unable to struggle openly against the strong will of the First Consul and prevent the reconciliation of France with the Church, they neglected no opportunity of placing obstacles in the way of the loyal performance of the stipulations of the Concordat. The first of these was to persuade the First Consul to nominate a certain number of the schismatic Bishops to the new sees without requiring that they should previously retract their error and accept the condemnation

the Emperor that "in general, Talleyrand has always shown the utmost ill-will towards the reestablishment of the Catholic religion in France; which is easily explained by the embarrassment which would be the result for himself, on account of his former position as Bishop. He has even gone so far as to suggest to Bonaparte to remain separated from the Church of Rome, and to name a Patriarch of Gaul. It may be said that the First Consul is the only one who has wished that the Catholic religion should be reestablished, as all the other persons in authority have been of a contrary opinion." Documents, t. III., p. 52, No. 559. Cobenzel à l'Empereur, Paris, 18 Juin, 1801.

⁵¹ Consalvi, *Mémoires*, t. I., p. 386.

pronounced by the Holy See on the Civil Constitution of the clergy. Bonaparte announced his intention abruptly, as was his custom, to Cardinal Consalvi at an audience on July 20. For Consalvi it was "a new and terrible tempest" which caused him a profound agitation. He pointed out to Bonaparte that such a measure was impossible; that the Constitutional clergy were not in communion with the Holy See, and that at the beginning of the negotiations he had assured Cardinal Martiniana that he did not wish to hear them mentioned. Bonaparte replied that reasons of state obliged him to have some consideration for the Constitutional clergy, who formed a powerful party, and that the favor shown to them would please the *Corps Législatif* and induce it to accept the Concordat, which had so many enemies; but Consalvi again repeated that it was absolutely necessary that they should first retract their error and accept the Papal decrees which had condemned the Civil Constitution.

The Cardinal's arguments were unable to overcome Bonaparte's stubborn resistance, founded on his belief that a retraction was a dishonorable action. He also persisted, in spite of the Cardinal's protestations, in maintaining that it would suffice if the schismatic clergy were to declare that they accepted the judgments emanating from the Holy See, without, however, mentioning the Civil Constitution of the clergy, and he ended by requesting the Cardinal to treat the matter with his brother Joseph. The six plenipotentiaries met again on July 22. They discussed the draft of the bull sent from Rome which was to accompany the publication of the Concordat, and made some changes in it, suppressing, for instance, the words by which the Holy Father exhorted the new hierarchy to labor diligently for the restoration of chapters, seminaries, monasteries and convents. With regard to the Constitutional Bishops and priests the French representatives said that the government could not abandon them, as they had obeyed the decrees of an Assembly invested with power to make laws, and that the acceptance by them of the Concordat ought to suffice to reconcile them with the Holy See. They also wished that the Holy Father should make a direct appeal to the intrusive Bishops to resign their sees. On their side the Papal Envoys could only reply that they would seek to obtain from the Pope for the schismatic clergy as favorable terms as the Church could grant. They were not, however, mentioned in the Concordat, and its acceptance by them would not suffice to reconcile them without a retraction. They observed also that it was impossible for the Holy Father to apply directly to the intrusive Bishops for their resignation, as he did not look upon them as the legitimate occupiers of those sees. The views of the negotiators were too much opposed to allow them to come to any decision, and the Papal

Envoyés, in order to avoid an open rupture, declared that they would refer the whole matter to the Holy Father.⁵²

Two days later Cardinal Consalvi, with the intention of taking leave of the First Consul, went to one of the usual receptions given to the foreign diplomatists, at whose head he took his place. When Bonaparte entered and, according to his custom, began to pass before the Ambassadors drawn up in line, he looked steadily in the Cardinal's face and went on without saying a word to him, but stopped to have a long conversation with Count Cobenzel, who stood next to him, and then with the others, offering thus a deliberate insult to the representative of the Holy See.⁵³

Consalvi traveled day and night in order to assist at the deliberations held with regard to the Concordat previous to its ratification by the Pope. The smaller congregation of three Cardinals was at first convened for this purpose, then the larger, consisting of twelve, but the Holy Father decided at last to ask the opinions of all the members of the Sacred College then present in Rome, to the number of twenty-nine. The questions which were most discussed were the restriction imposed by the French Government on the publicity of worship and the alienation of Church property. A few Cardinals would have wished that the first, at least, should be modified, but the majority agreed that the necessity of putting an end to one of the most cruel persecutions that the Church has ever undergone and of reestablishing the hierarchy justified the sacrifices which had been made. Pius VII. allowed the Cardinals to express their views freely. He spoke the last and declared that he was decided to accept the treaty. The ratification was signed in Rome on August 15, and to satisfy those Cardinals who objected to the police regulations the Holy Father signed also a ratification drawn up in a slightly modified form, in which he took note of what Bonaparte had said with regard to the temporary character of these regulations. The two copies were sent to Mgr. Spina, who, knowing the spirit of the government with which he had to deal, presented only that which ratified the Concordat without conditions.

The ratification by the First Consul took place on September 8, 1801; but, in spite of the impatience which he had so often manifested in the course of the negotiations for their speedy conclusion, the Concordat was not laid before the *Corps Légitif* and the *Tribunat*, passed as a law and presented to the public until April 8 of the following year. The delay was caused by the enemies of the

⁵² Consalvi, *Mémoires*, t. I., p. 388. Documents, t. III., p. 289, No. 665. Conférence entre les Plénipotentiaires, 22 Juillet, p. 292, No. 666. Consalvi à Doria, 24 luglio, 1801.

⁵³ Consalvi, *Mémoires*, t. I., p. 393.
Bayswater, London, England.

Church, who, though they had not been able to prevent the conclusion of the Concordat, had persuaded Bonaparte to demand the acceptance by the Pope of some of the schismatic Bishops, and who now prepared a series of regulations entitled *les Articles Organiques*, by which they sought to subject the Church of France to the civil authorities. It is needless to say that the Holy Father had not been in any way consulted with regard to these articles, which in many ways modified the Concordat and departed from its stipulations. The idea seems to have originated with Talleyrand, who even before the ratification of the Concordat suggested to Bonaparte that he might find some means of escaping from the obligations it imposed on him by special decrees adapted to such cases as might be found inconvenient. Not the least dishonest feature in this transaction is that these articles were voted by the *Corps Légitif* and published at the same time as the Concordat, as if they formed part of the same treaty and possessed an equal authority.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

A SUMMONS TO IRISH SCHOLARSHIP.

ACCORDING to one of the older bardic legends, there is a castle somewhere in the realm of the Unseen Ireland wherein a thousand knights lie slumbering, under an enchanter's spell, awaiting the summons to battle when the hour for Ireland's deliverance is at hand. Whatever the poetical value of the myth, it has a practical meaning as an allegory. A thousand ancient Irish manuscripts, written in archaic language some of them, await the coming of great scholars to decipher their text and do battle for the overthrow of the millennial conspiracy against the civilization of an ancient and original race, its laws, its institutions, its language, its music, its poetry, its genius and its aspirations. We have seen a multitude of undeciphered manuscripts in the Museum of the Royal Irish Academy—treatises on medicine, on astronomy, on botany, on geography and other sciences, as the visitor may see from the diagrams that are beheld on some of the pages. In the library of Trinity College, Dublin, are many more, and again many more in Marsh's Library, near St. Patrick's Cathedral, in the same city. In the libraries of the Irish aristocracy doubtless there are many old and precious manuscripts. Over the continent of Europe are scattered a great number of literary treasures. German scholars, like Professors Roehrig and Kuno Meyer, know the value

of these, and French ones like Professor De Jubainville. The Irish *savants* who have devoted attention to them are few and far between. O'Donovan and O'Curry pointed out where the Manuscript Materials for a genuine Irish History were to be sought for. But up to the present time little has been attempted in the way of inaugurating a labor which ought to be entered on as a sacred national duty. We believe there ought to be a State appropriation for so vital and urgent a work. The object is worthy of such a stimulus. It is too great for individual effort or a single cycle of research. The grants made from time to time by the British Government never contemplated anything more extensive than a reproduction or a translation of the best known of the ancient manuscripts—a mere academical excursion into a field but little known and by no means regarded with relish, for very obvious reasons, by the rulers of Ireland. What is needed is an undertaking somewhat analogous to that of Owen or Cuvier in the naturalist field when they were presented with a fragment of the vertebrae or the wing of a fossil bird or beast that had become extinct. The whole anatomy had to be synthetically reconstructed by means of the clue. And so it must be, in a large measure, in regard to the framework of the ancient history of Ireland. The clues are numerous but scattered, and the articulation very much disjointed.

In a work recently issued from the press, an Irish lady, Alice Stopford Green, relict of the English historian who wrote the "Short History of the English People" and daughter of the late Archdeacon Stopford, a learned antiquarian, sets forth some reasons why Irish scholars should take up the patriotic work of searching out the true story of their country's rise in civilization and its unhappy downfall. She gives to her work the title "The Making and the Unmaking of Ireland." "Unmaking" is a good word: it means the undoing, or the assassination. And this is precisely what the rulers of England from the times of the Plantagenets down to those of William Pitt, by a gradual but undeviating policy, carried out with regard to the Irish nation.

A fine enthusiasm impels the writer of this new call to patriotic scholarship. But the reasons she urges are not all sentimental. For example, the following:

"There is no more pious duty to all of Irish birth than to help in recovering from centuries of obloquy the memory of noble men, Irish and Anglo-Irish, who built up the civilization that once adorned their country. To them has been meted out the second death—the lot feared beyond all else by men of honor. They have been buried by the false hands of strangers in the deep pit of contempt, reproach and forgetfulness—an unmerited grave of silence and of shame.

"They alone, among the nations, have been taunted with ancestors sunk in primitive disorders incapable of development in the land they wasted. A picture of unrelieved barbarism, 'hateful to God,' served to justify to strangers the English extirpation of Irish society, and has been used to depress the hearts of the Irish themselves. For their birthright—they have been told—they have inherited the failings of their race, and by the verdict of the ages have been proclaimed incapable of success in their own land."

This is a heavy indictment. Only against one other government in Christendom could a similar one be truly drawn. In the crushing out of Poland's national life we can discern a parallel, but only an inadequate one; the process was of much briefer duration. Ireland's torture lasted three times as long as that of Poland.

The process adopted by the English historians of Ireland bears a curious resemblance to the ideal journalism of to-day. To show nothing but the dark side of humanity by going into the most painful minutiae of all the crimes that are daily perpetrated, and so leave the historians who shall write future chronicles from the newspapers of the days we now live in under the belief that there is nothing to relieve the picture of a savage reign of lawlessness and licentiousness: such was the "modus operandi" of the traducers who undertook to teach the people of England and the outside world what manner of people were the Irish and why they deserved no commiseration under oppression.

It were most devoutly to be wished that at this crisis in Ireland's fortunes some scholars animated by a spirit like that of the late Sir John T. Gilbert should arise and devote themselves to a crusade of redress and vindication. That eminent scholar, by the force of contagious fervor, drew along with him other ardent antiquarians like Dr. Graves, Dr. Reeves, the Rev. James Henthorne Todd and a few other lovers of Ireland's departed glories. These men were paladins, so to speak, in their particular field. Whether they have left any rightful heirs to their genius and their enthusiasm is as yet a matter of uncertainty, which this book of Mrs. Green's may be the means of resolving by means of its practical results.

The need is urgent. Not yet is the poisoned pen of the falsifier laid aside. Men like Dr. Mahaffy still pour out pamphlets and magazine articles holding up the ancient Irish civilization to the scorn of the world. Of this learned pundit the author of the new book has something of importance to say in her pungent foot notes. In one of these she scores him thus:

"Dr. Mahaffy, who sees in Shane O'Neill a Zulu or a Maori chief with a retinue of armed savages, says he burned Armagh Cathedral not from a hatred of Christianity, but merely from the uncontrolled

love of plunder shown by barbarians in all ages. Shane attacked the cathedral when the Earl of Sussex had turned it into a barrack, and when he had further, by a lying trick, refilled it with the soldiers he had by treaty pledged himself to withdraw."

Dr. Mahaffy is by no means the only one who has in our own day sneered at the ancient civilization of Ireland. Froude was equally prejudiced against it. There were writers on the Dublin press when we first joined it who had the effrontery, while totally ignorant of the Irish language, to sneer at the work of Sir John T. Gilbert in his fine reproductions of the "Leabhar na h-Uidhri," the "Leabhar Breac," and other ancient Irish manuscripts as a waste of money on piles of barbarous jargon! A long article of the "Seanchus Mor" we especially remember as bitterly assailing the policy of paying out public money for the perpetuation of such an outlandish mockery of literature and caricatures of lawmaking such as the Brehon Laws! The writer of such reviews it was our fortune to know. He was a patriotic Irishman, according to his lights, and a very able writer on most other subjects; but the fact that his early education had been received in the Bluecoat School in Dublin gave him a bias on the subject of Irish civilization that he could never wholly repress when writing on matters in which historical questions arose. His later education was derived from Trinity College professors who were by no means likely to induce him to form a more favorable opinion regarding the value of Irish laws and letters.

For years Sir John Gilbert was obliged to work in the teeth of obstacles that arose from the dissemination of such criticisms among influential persons. It was our own good fortune to inaugurate a better condition of things in the Dublin press a little later on.

The fields of inquiry toward which the author of the new book points her wand are: 1, Ireland's ancient commerce; 2, Ireland's industries; 3, Irish learning; 4, Ireland's country life. In considering those several divisions of the subject the seekers will be much helped by noting the sub-divisions into which the author deviates in the pursuit of her large task of analysis of the causes of slow ruin and synthesis of robber reconstruction above the ruin.

It has been contended by several non-Irish scholars—even by the learned Bollandus—that there was no written language in Ireland previous to the coming of St. Patrick, and that he introduced the characters now in use—a sort of uncial writing of the Latin language common in his time all over civilized Europe. This is a point that there ought to be some means of determining. It is certain that there was some sort of writing employed in earlier times; the ogham inscriptions are proof of this. These may have been the work of the Druids, who probably used a cryptic or hierophantic medium,

like the priests of Egypt in the Mosaic era. The old tradition of a Celtic connection with Egypt through the marriage of Niul, the Scythian prince, to Scota, the Egyptian princess, daughter of Pharaoh Cincris, is to some extent borne out by a few slender facts. The royal pair had a son named Gaodhal, from whose name the modern word *Gael* is derived, according to some authorities, and from whom the Milesian gens is said to have descended. Whether the Irish ogham was the same as that used by the ancient Egyptian priests may be revealed at some future period, through the researches of the explorers now patiently seeking out the secrets of the Pyramids and the sand-covered temples of an older date in the vicinity of the Nile. But the existence of the Irish oghams points almost certainly to the conclusion that a more intelligible language was employed for common use when the oghams were resorted to, and that that language is existent to this day, in the same characters as represented it in the earliest historic period. The Abbé MacGeoghegan offers substantial evidence of the existence of an Irish written language prior to the advent of St. Patrick, as well as of the distinctiveness of that language by reason of its independent structure and characters, and its scientific grammatical design and complete efficiency as a vehicle of facts, thoughts, and gradations of ideas. Modern scholarship will surely be able to elucidate for the general benefit the very interesting question involved in the conflicting theories on the origin of the Irish language and its written forms of expression.

Commerce, the tie that binds the nations in peace together, was the primary cause of Ireland's undoing, it may be reasonably predicated. From the earliest historical period there was trade between the island and the European Continent. Even from remote Phoenicia came ships to trade with the Irish chiefs and the Cornwall tin miners. Great fairs in the different provinces had from time immemorial been held for the purpose of interchanging the different products of each region. To reach these trysting places a system of wide roads had been constructed, the principal ones converging on Tara, and offshoots radiating away to the main seaports. A chain of natural lakes connected by canals helped to carry the commerce. The great fair of Enniscorthy, say the Annals of the Four Masters, it would be hard to describe, because of the numbers of steeds, horses, gold, silver and foreign wares at that fair. Ships from Spain and Portugal, laden with olives and wine, filled the southern and western harbors periodically, discharging their cargoes and getting others of hides, wool, linen and other commodities. Irish ships were thick in Continental ports, while the ships of France, Spain, Holland and Italy crowded the harbors along the

Irish coast. It was not long after the Saxon kingdom fell at Hastings before the envious eyes of the Norman victors were turned toward the rich green isle from whose ports came the barques laden with its riches into the Thames and the Severn and the Mersey. "For the conquest of that land," said William Rufus, "I will gather all the ships of my kingdom, and will make of them a bridge to cross over." This charitable intention was frustrated by the arrow of Walter Tyrrell, but one of his successors, the murderer of Thomas à-Beckett, took it over along with the crown and began the work of carrying it into effect. From that day forward the destruction of Irish commerce was carried on, not continuously, but intermittently, as the struggle for possession of the country fluctuated, but with a deadly tenacity of purpose such as animated the rulers of Rome during all the Punic wars, and the trade of Ireland fell even as fell the Carthaginian city and power.

Long prior to the Norman Conquest, however, the Irish had acquired a Continental renown, not only for the excellence of their natural products, but also for their skill in manufacturing them into materials for dress and everyday use and comfort. In the production of serge and linen the natives were particularly skilled. Fazio degli Uberti, who wrote the "Dittamondo" (fourteenth century), described the arts and products of Ireland as he had seen them in his visit to the island, and says of it that it is "a country worthy of renown for the beautiful serges she sends us;" and Lord Charlemont unearthed an entry in an old Italian ledger showing that the material was used by the wives of the Doges for ceremonial gowns in the Middle Ages, before the time the poet praised it. The Brehon Laws contain many valuable minutiae relative to the processes by which wool was prepared, as well as to the spinning, weaving, napping and dying of the cloth when woven. The authorities on this branch of the subject are many. Mrs. Green's book gives a vast number of references, showing how searching was her inquiry and how extensive its scope; yet we may fairly assume that the field is by no means exhausted.

Learning, the nobler bond that unites the higher part of mankind, the mind and soul, was from the remotest times highly prized and sedulously taught in Ireland. Even in the pagan cycles it was cultivated carefully. The ollamhs (olaves) and the bards were its great and honored custodians, and these ranked next to royalty because of their high and envied distinction. After the introduction of Christianity it received a mighty impetus. Whether St. Patrick found letters existing in the island previous to his advent is a moot point, but that he himself used the Irish character now taught is certain, for there is in the Royal Irish Academy a fragment of the

Gospels written by his own hand, as most authorities agree. In the museums of the European Continent, and especially those of the northern countries, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Iceland, it is more than likely that many ancient manuscripts relating to Ireland are preserved, because of the close relations between those countries and the Western Isles for many centuries before the Anglo-Norman period. Multitudes of manuscripts were destroyed by the barbarian Danes in the course of the centuries wherein they ravaged the Irish coast towns, for the monasteries were the special objective points of their destructive fury. Many of the monks who were driven out by the onslaught of the murdering hordes fled to the Continent carrying with them as many valuable writings as they conveniently could bear or stow away safely, and it is to be presumed that a remnant of those treasures has been preserved, in scattered quantities, in unfrequented places on the European Continent. Even in the "dark ages," as they are absurdly called, Irish learning abounded, Continental learning was brought over, in exchange for what the monks from Ireland brought to the Continent. Greek was studied pretty extensively—even when its use had died out in Italy. Greek manuscripts were written by Irish hands. The "Proverbia Grecorum" is the name of a book of the seventh century—proverbs translated, by some diligent Irish monk, from Greek into Latin. In Archbishop Ussher's time he found in Trim a church known as the "Greek Church," which the visitation book described as "the Greek School." There was a famous Irish scholar, Roderick Cassidy, who was called "the Grecian," because of his proficiency in the classic tongue of the Hellenes. Mrs. Green remarks that after the tenth century there is no further mention of Greek learning in Ireland—but this is a point that may yet be decided by skilled investigation. Latin was very generally used by poets and scholars, even down to the Tudor period—especially in the South of Ireland. The County Kerry was long famous for its "poor scholars" and "hedge schoolmasters" who were skilled adepts in Latinity and classical construction.

The literature connected with the spot popularly known as St. Patrick's Purgatory occupies a niche of fame quite unique and unprecedented in history. Large as the volume of that literature is, there is good reason for believing that there is yet much more of it remaining for the eyes of discoverers to unearth. Learned and pious travelers came from every European country to make the pilgrimage to St. Patrick's Purgatory. Even royalty and high nobility came at times to do the penitential offices and witness for themselves the marvels that the vigil in the gloomy cave was said to be sure to bring. The weird stories that were told and written

about the sanctum gave origin, many authorities hold, to some of the passages in Dante's great comedy. Frederic Ozanam, in his work on "Les Sources Poétiques de Dante," says: "La tradition du Purgatoire de Saint Patrice se ratache aux premiers souvenirs du Christianisme chez l'Irlandais: la vision de Tundale, celle de Saint Brendan, leur appartiennent aussi." There must have been a vast body of literature on this subject, owing to the notoriety given to it by successive eminent scholars—Henry of Saltry, Marie de France, Caesarius of Heisterbach, Jacobus de Voragine, Giraldus Cambrensis, Matthew Paris and many more. Mrs. Green's book, we may remark, furnishes not only general heads of inquiry into the several departments of Irish history, but gives some valuable lists of books that are likely to be of great help to the scholars who may undertake the task of helping to transform the fragmentary into the complete.

Ireland, it is shown quite clearly by Mrs. Green, was a place not of barbarism, but of great learning for many centuries; but with all this, the edifice of scholarship was imperfect. The country had no university. For what reason? Because the hand of barbarism arrested her natural development. Three attempts had been made to found a university—as Ware's historical works and those of Hollinshed show—but they were all doomed to failure, chiefly by the fact of the English invasion. "It was the doom oof Ireland," the writer pathetically remarks, "to send unwillingly her successive generations to swell the list of continental scholars, and ever to drain herself bare of the genius she had created."

Morals and minstrelsy, dress and hospitality—these sure indications of a national civilization—furnished the interested traducers of Ireland with a fruitful field for their malevolent industry. We have already adverted to the system of slander upon the morals and the mode in dress of the Irish people which the invaders resorted to for the purpose of excusing their own sins of spoliation and oppression. We find in Mrs. Green's book an explanation of the seeming want of modesty alleged against Irish women by Edmund Spenser, Fynes Moryson, the anonymous Bohemian Baron whom Moryson quoted and others. It is well to mark this explanation and bear it well in mind, because even to this very day the system of vilification with regard to the character of the Irish people is pursued as a deliberate policy by certain Tory landlords and by Tory papers like *The Times*, for the purpose of justifying a continuance of the prescriptive policy of coercion and oppression of the inhabitants of Ireland. There was a long-standing friendship between the people of the South and West of Ireland and the people and crown of Spain. This was the effect of a community of religion and the

interchange of commodities by commerce. Cork, Limerick and Galway did a great trade with the merchants of the chief Spanish seaports. The attempt to fasten the Reformation upon Galway was preceded by the despatch of a fleet, under Admiral Winter, to intercept the commerce of the port and cut off the supplies of food and wine which the French and Spanish ships had hitherto furnished. The President of Munster, Malby, was given control of the province and port, and he entered upon the work of reforming things in Church and State therein so heartily that he very soon had the inhabitants in revolt. Malby despatched a garrison of English troops from Berwick to overcome the city, lodging them in the Castle. He reproached the Mayor of Galway because of his having sent supplies to the men of Munster who had risen in rebellion, and exacted heavy tributes from the chief merchants, as well as the corporation, by way of punishment. The women of Galway had shown their friendship for Spain by wrapping in fine linen the bodies of the Spaniards drowned off the coast during the disaster to the Armada, and this kindness was another reason for the exhibition of Malby's malevolence. Soon the trade of Galway was ruined by the exactions of the English and the blockade maintained by Winter's ships, yet the inhabitants stubbornly refused to be reconciled to their brutal oppressors. When Lord Fitzwilliam, as Deputy, went down from Dublin Castle to take matters in hand in the old city, not one member of the Corporation called to visit him, which gave him deadly offense, and he remarked bitterly to those about him: "There be merchants of Galway which daily come out of Spain." This brought on the inhabitants the curse of martial law in all its fury. The soldiery were allowed to do just as they pleased, and they plundered the inhabitants. Now for the charge that the women of Ireland were addicted to the giving of scandal by their mode of attire and general behavior. Mrs. Green quotes from the author of "Cambrensis Eversus":

"A fellow named Hurd, who was promoted, I hear, from his carpenter's shop to a lieutenancy in the army, was Governor of Galway in the absence of Peter Stuburs, the superintendent of commerce, who had once been a peddler." Hurd, "under the prompting of some evil spirit," ordered that no woman in Galway should wear her Irish cloak. "But, lo! next day the unseemly exhibition in the streets of Galway, most of the women appearing in men's coats—high-born ladies, who had been plundered of all their property by the rapacious soldiers, sinking with shame before the gaze of the public, with their ragged or patched clothes, and sometimes with embroidered table-covers, or a strip of tapestry torn from the walls, or some lappets cut from the bed curtains, thrown over their heads

and shoulders. Other women covered their shoulders only, with blankets or sheets, or table-cloths, or any other sort of wrapper they could lay their hands on. You would have taken your oath that all Galway was a masquerade, the unrivaled home of scenic buffoons, so irresistibly ludicrous were the varied dresses of the poor women"—a scene planned for the sport of Hurd and his associates, "that they might distort their visages and shake their sides at the ridiculous plight of the people, and that the soldiers might not only make money by the confiscated cloaks, but wring, with his property, bitter tears from the citizen."

The author of "Cambrensis Eversus" was an eye-witness of many such scenes. He was a priest—the Rev. Richard Kelley—and had to travel over many parts of the island in disguise, for it was death then for any priest who was caught, and death to any one who was found giving a priest asylum or help of any kind. The scene he here depicts was an example of the general condition of the country in all those portions of it where military operations were carried on under Moountjoy and Malby and Bagenal and Essex, under Elizabeth's reign and that of James I. Not only did the dastardly usurpers despoil the women of their raiment, but their villainous historians strove to strip them likewise of their womanly mantles of modesty and good breeding. What parallel can be found in history for vileness so execrable as this?

Cork made even a more determined stand against English rule: it had long been proud of its designation of "rebel Cork"—and in Limerick and Waterford and Wexford the resistance of the burghers and trades guilds was long, stubborn and determined. As a punishment for this temerity, when the Lord Deputies could not destroy the religion of the people, they got the English Parliament to deprive the Irish corporate towns of those liberties given them under the charters of King John and his father, Henry. Mountjoy boasted that he would cut King John's charter to Waterford with King James' sword. The towns were not intimidated into submission to the Church of Elizabeth and James. Their mayors and magistrates were not to be coerced into taking the oath of supremacy that branded their religion as idolatry and blasphemous superstition, and cheerfully went to prison instead. Desperate over this unexpected contumacy, the Queen and her advisers proceeded against the rebels with the truculence of the Egyptian Pharaohs. They brought Englishmen over to seat them in the mayors' and magistrates' chairs: the Popish "rabble" who refused to go to their English service in the stolen churches they tried to drive out wholesale by importing hordes of "planters," the scum of the English towns and jailbirds; and by these measures, after some years, the

semblance of partial loyalty was given the chief cities of Southern and Western Ireland. The national Church was wiped out, and the English "Establishment," now defunct, but continued under the name of the Church of Ireland, was erected upon the ruins.

Goldwin Smith is an Oxford professor who does not advocate the emancipation of Ireland from English rule, nor does he admire the Catholic religion. He is not quoted by Mrs. Green, but he might with advantage have been referred to as a witness from the English side who could bear out the very strongest accusations of foul play that any Irish protagonist could bring forward. He notes that all the torture and agony inflicted upon the Irish people in those woful centuries since the Tudor days were perpetrated chiefly for the purpose of forming in Ireland a Protestant Ascendency party—a permanent garrison for Protestant England in a Catholic country. He notes with especial indignation that solely for this purpose was the Irish Rebellion of 1798 fomented and encouraged by William Pitt, and he denounces the perpetrators of the horrors which preceded and succeeded that heroic but hopeless attempt of a maddened people to shake off the yoke of the persecutors in language as honestly indignant as any Irishman has ever employed. Speaking of the atrocities perpetrated by Thomas Judkin Fitzgerald, Hunter Gowan and other magisterial brutes who commanded the yeomanry in Ireland, and had men, even priests, flogged to death in that terrible time, he said (we quote from his Oxford Lectures, published in 1867):

"To add to the bright roll of English honor, Mr. Thomas Judkin Fitzgerald received a pension, and, at the Union, was made a baronet of the United Kingdom.

"These men were not fiends; they were a dominant class, the planter-class of Ireland, maddened with cruel panic and administering martial law. It is good that these things should be recalled to mind when we see men of letters and artists, who have been brought up in the air of English liberty and within the sound of Christian church bells, proposing to blow Fenians from guns, and to reenact on Irish insurgents the atrocities which marked the putting down of the Indian mutineers.

"Ireland had what one of our prelates calls a Missionary Church; that is an establishment profusely endowed out of the penury and the misery of the Irish people; and the Bishops and clergy of which were intended, I suppose, to be placed by their wealth and privileges above the passions of any class, and enabled boldly to preach justice and mercy. What were they doing? Were they preaching justice and mercy, or were they doing what the prelates and clergy of the planter church of Jamaica do now—drawing up certificates of Chris-

tian character for men whose hands were red with innocent blood? It is a point which I have never been able clearly to ascertain.

"There is nothing in this revolting history more revolting than the cant about loyalty. Loyalty is not due from the conquered and the oppressed to the conqueror and oppressor. Nothing is due but submission, which the conqueror and oppressor must enforce as best he can."

Mrs. Green quotes Goldwin Smith as one of those who held that Ireland's history may not unprofitably be neglected because he studied from a work entitled "Annals of England," an Oxford textbook which contained, amongst other gems of philosophy, the excuse that Ireland's history reveals "nothing but a dreary picture of convulsions and blood, painful to peruse, and but slightly connected with that of any other country." Goldwin Smith did write sympathetically of Ireland's immeasurable wrong when he came to know more about it, while his contemporary, Froude, wrote, though knowing the truth perhaps better than Smith, most unsympathetically and in the vein of the Elizabethan apologists that it was a Christian duty to rob and exterminate so un-Christian a crew of savages as the "wild Irishry" were. If Mrs. Green is tender about the share of responsibility of the Established Church for the rule of oppression in Ireland, it is impossible not to respect her reticence; and it is right to recall that while that Church, as a whole, was indeed largely responsible for the system that goaded the Irish into the madness of revolt against hopeless odds, very many individuals of the body furnished bright examples of a better spirit by dissuading the instruments of martial law from measures of wholesale cruelty and counselling clemency whenever they could do so with hope of success. But the ministers who used, in the time of the Tithe War, to ride at the head of bailiffs and police, with pistols in belt, to collect the tenants' tithes, in stock and produce of the soil, were more often typical of the spirit of "the Establishment" toward the Irish cultivators than those of the gentler sort. If we must have the truth, let us have the whole truth, that justice may be done even to the Whiteboys and the followers of "Captain Rock."

Ruthless as had been the policy of the English Kings toward the Irish chiefs and people, there was no systematic attempt to make a clean sweep of all native institutions and social organization until the reign of Henry VIII. Edward III. had statutes passed to keep Irish and English apart, by discriminating in the penalties for crime imposed respectively upon the one and the other, and passing simptuary laws requiring that the dress of either should bespeak his nationality and indicate consequently the treatment that should be allotted in case of "chance medley" within the circumscription of

the Pale. But all such attempts were only piecemeal and tentative extension of English sway. It remained for the terrible Tudor monarch to introduce scientific pursuit of a policy of genuine conquest, on different lines and by different methods. The new idea was, not segregation, but assimilation. The task of wholesale extermination, which was at once contemplated, with the idea of substituting English settlers for the dispossessed or slain tribesmen, was found to be impracticable because of its magnitude and the physical difficulties that forbade its execution, in the way of bogs and woods and mountains which afforded protection and shelter to the natives while furnishing only death traps and natural ambuscades for the invaders. A mixture of craft and force, it would appear, was then decided on as best calculated to realize the grand scheme of a complete Anglicization of the island. Thomas Cromwell, the apt pupil of Machiavelli, became adviser to Henry when Wolsey fell, and it is not difficult to distinguish the hand that compassed the spoliation of the English monasteries and made his master greater in power than the Sovereign Pontiff in the measures that were successively taken in the long campaign for the final reduction of Ireland. While Sydney and Skeffington, each in his day, battered the castles of the chiefs and ravaged the fields of their tribesmen, the chiefs themselves were cajoled into going over to Greenwich and making their submission to the King, receiving in return an English title to their lands and an English title, that of earl, for each of themselves. This strategy was successful. The chiefs deemed, seemingly, that the metamorphosis was only one in name, but they soon found out that the transformation was more significant than it appeared at first blush, since henceforth their land was subject to the operations of English law, where their own system, the ancient Brehon, had worked for centuries automatically, so to speak, in the settlement of all problems relating to the land and the possessions of the people as they were affected by the more ancient law of death and human vicissitude. The fidelity of the chiefs to the new and strange order of things to which they had been unwillingly introduced was insured by the taking of hostages from each family, and the double object of securing the loyalty of the father and undermining the patriotism of the son, by inducting him into English ways of life and modes of learning and speech, was attained by the one coup. From this period onward the deliberate destruction of Irish law, Irish language and Irish religion was mercilessly pursued. The chiefs began to have their children at home instructed in the English language, by sending them into the cities where there were schools conducted by teachers who were bi-lingual, or having tutors for them at home who were qualified in a similar way and

ould teach Latin as well. This particular cycle of the transition is rich in materials for the reconstructors of Irish history. It was a period of great scholars, and many writings have come down to prove the scope and variety of their erudition and genius. Mrs. Green gives the names and brief descriptions of several of the more famous. She takes from Hollinshed the quaint sketch of one therein tersely set forth, thus:

"David Fitzgerald, usually called David Duff (or Black Daniel), born in Kerry, a civilian, a maker in Irish, not ignorant of music, skillful in physic, a good and general craftsman much like to Hippias, surpassing all men in the multitude of crafts, who coming on a time to Pisa to the great triumph called Olympicum, wore nothing but such as was of his own making: his shoes, his pattens, his cloak, his coat, the ring that he did wear, with a signet therein very perfectly wrought, were all made by him. He played excellently on all kinds of instruments, and sung thereto his own verses, which no man could amend. In all parts of logic, rhetoric and philosophy he vanquished all men, and was vanquished of none."

This must have been the model which the later all-round phenomenon known as the Admirable Crichton set before his mind's eye when setting out for the prize of universal attainments in culture. Mrs. Green enumerates many other scholars who were not merely philomaths but *virtuosi*—but not altogether of David Duff's renown—who flourished from the Middle Ages down to the time of the Tudor conquest. To other hands she leaves the task of revealing the work each did in his own sphere in the building of that Irish Temple of Fame which the ruthless hands of Plantagenet and Tudor so sedulously labored to demolish and destroy, and damn with the curse of ignorance besides.

There was one stone in that temple that defied the ingenious malice of the Vandal destroyers, because it is like the human soul, indestructible. This was the music of Ireland. It has survived despite all the ruin and misery of the conquest and the agony of the penal days. The harper and the bard were often conjoined in the one person, and the glorious legacy, the goodly company that flourished before the destroying Tudors came on the scene, is still in great part preserved in the exquisite collection of Hardiman and Petrie. They could kill the body of Ireland, but the soul was as "the intrenchant air" to the sword of the spoiler.

Before we take leave of the share of the bards and scholars, as a task to be taken up by the rebuilders of the old temple, it is not fitting to overlook one of the finger-posts which Mrs. Green has set upon the road of inquiry. It has often been urged as a reason for Ireland's failure to maintain her independence that there was

no idea of national solidarity to bind the people and make resistance to England general. It is doubtless true that the tribal system was not conducive to homogeneity, as a general rule, but it is no less true that on various occasions the common danger begot a common resistance and a widespread, if not wholly united effort, as in the case of the Danish overthrow at Clontarf.

The scholarship of Ireland was one great bond of unity. The principal learned men of the country came forth from the halls of the chiefs, wherein they taught languages and poetry and music, to gather in council at Tara, and interchange the coinage of their bright minds for the advancement of learning and the promotion of the noble arts of poesy and song. "The greatest lesson of the scholars' gathering," remarks Mrs. Green, was their perpetual remembrance of the bond of learning which knit together the whole Irish race on both sides of the sea—that spiritual commonwealth which had never yet been utterly overthrown since the days of Columcille. "For it is a signal fact that Irish education never lost sight of a national union; it never ceased, from the gatherings at Tara down through the centuries, to stir the people of Ireland with the remembrance of their common inheritance in all that shapes the thought and spiritual life of a people." Mrs. Green's patriotic indignation is justly aroused over the fact that such noble scholarship and poetry as these assemblies represented should be held up to the world's scorn by the contemptuous references of Spenser to "a certain kind of people called bards which are to them instead of poets"—references which are still repeated by men like Dr. Mahaffy and his followers with regard to Irish scholarship. "The weight of centuries of calumny lies heavy on their graves!" indignantly exclaims the author. What more patriotic, more just, more honorable task could arouse the enthusiasm of Irish *illuminati* than that of refuting this ancient calumny, this unmerited damnation of ignominy? To clear the fame of the unjustly condemned is an ambition that has often stirred even magnanimous strangers to action. If chivalry can be excited in foreign bosoms by such a moral incentive, how much more ardor should it summon to the filial duty of clearing the good name of a long-outraged and slandered motherland! The hour has seemingly come when the slumbering warriors of light are to wake to battle at the sound of the Ossianic horn and sweep the hosts of calumny into the sea of exposure.

It is only proper to note here that in the sympathetic attitude which Mrs. Green has taken up regarding the oppression and undoing of Ireland she is but following up the course taken by her distinguished husband when he was writing his "Short History."

Though he did not devote so large a space to the subject of the English doings in Ireland the terse and graphic way in which he sketches the proceedings of the conquerors leaves no doubt that he entirely disapproved of such methods of "civilizing" people as they adopted, and that he by no means shared the belief, or pretended belief, of the "philanthropic" invaders that the people of Ireland were barbarous and their laws and customs outlandish or ridiculous. For instance, dealing with the policy of Henry VIII. toward Ireland, he says: "Submission was far from being all that Henry desired. His aim was to civilize the people whom he had conquered—to rule not by force but by law. But the only conception of law which the King or his Ministers could frame was that of English law. The customary law which prevailed without the Pale—the native system of clan government and common tenure of land by the tribe, as well as the poetry and literature which threw their lustre over the Irish tongue, were either unknown to the English statesmen or despised by them as barbarous. The one mode of civilizing Ireland and redressing its chaotic misrule which presented itself to their minds was that of destroying the whole Celtic tradition of the Irish people—that of 'making Ireland English,' in manners, in law and in tongue. . . . The prohibition of the national dress, customs, laws and language must have seemed to them merely the suppression of a barbarism which stood in the way of all improvement." Mr. Green evidently did not regard the ancient laws and literature of Ireland as those of a barbarous race, as at the beginning of his "Short History" he gives a long list of the Irish authorities whom he had consulted regarding those portions of the chronicle which related to Irish affairs. These include the Annals of the Four Masters, Colgan's Hagiology, Adamnan's Life of Columba, Cormac's Glossary, the Book of Rights, the "Chronicon Scotorum," the "Wars of the Gaedhil with the Gaill," the "Annals of Lough Cé," and O'Donovan's and O'Curry's works on ancient Irish families, laws and customs. This list reveals the extraordinary erudition of the English scholar who was fortunate enough to secure the daughter of an Irish scholar for a helpmate in his labors.

The need of the time, so far as the vindication of Ireland's fame in the past is concerned, would appear to be a class in the new University for the special study of Irish archaeology and a commission for the quest after Irish manuscripts all over the world—for indeed the dispersal of these precious legacies was for a considerable period world-wide. The stage is now clear for the work—a work of love it surely ought to be—and the actors ought soon to be ready to play their honorable parts.

THE SECOND DEGREE OF MARTYRDOM.

THE timid Christian, who in the early days of the Church fled from persecution rather than deny Christ, has won from no less an authority than St. Cyprian the enviable title of "martyr of the second degree."¹ Nor will this designation surprise us if we recall the example and injunction to prudent flight given us in Sacred Writ by the Divine Master and His Apostles. The graphic picture which St. Paul draws (II. Cor. xi., 26-27) of the trials attendant on bearing the good tidings to the nations is almost prophetic of the sufferings of the confessors of subsequent times. The many lucid explanations of the Fathers who interpreted the mind of the Church in a practical manner, as also the many examples of discreet flight recorded in the Acts of the Martyrs, prove that numberless exiles and emigré priests of the early times endured heroically and at length many tribulations from which they would have been freed by immediate martyrdom for Christ. Hence the "extorres," as they are called, were found worthy to labor at the spread of the Gospel. No doubt flight misinterpreted as cowardice was repudiated by a handful of reformers who wished to seem wiser and holier than the Church herself. But the humble, docile child of that good mother took, when necessary, the long and weary road of exile, shedding all along the painful way the sweet odor of Christianity and meeting everywhere with the tenderest expressions of Christian charity. And thus the saving doctrine has been handed down to our own day without scandal or detriment to the faithful. A careful study, therefore, of this question of flight before persecution cannot but be interesting and instructive.²

There are certain archpriests of malignant hatred who would fain portray our Lord Jesus Christ as constantly and openly defying Jewish prejudice and rabbinical rage. Looking only to one phase of the Godman's life, they insist strongly and exclusively on His superb and surpassing courage in preaching a gospel that struck a decisive blow at the ancient established order. The message of the Messiah made manifest that the Old Covenant was fulfilled by the New, and thereby abolished. No wonder, then, that Christ was hated and hunted down like an escaped and dangerous enemy of human kind by men whose interests were in one way or another

¹ De Lapsis, 3.

² Mamachi, *Origines et Antiquitates Christianae* 111; Le Blant, *Les Persecuteurs et l'Martyre* 151-157; Leclercq, *Les Martyrs I.*, LXIV.-LXIX.; Jolyon, *La Fuite de la Persecution* (Lyons, 1903); Fassonius, *De Morali patrum Doctrina* (1766), "De appetendo adeundeque Martyrio" (Paris tertia lxxv.).

assailed and overthrown by His doctrine. But despite this true though one-sided picture, Jesus was essentially the Prince of Peace. Anarchy He preached not to the people. He alone could say with sublime assurance: "Learn of Me, for I am meek and humble of heart." Yet, although it was necessary that He must die in order that we might have life more abundantly, the Master had no mind to anticipate the will and decrees of His Father in heaven. Truly, His hour had not yet come when shortsighted men were planning His death (Matth. ii., 14, 21; xiv., 13; Luke ix., 10). And as the disciple is no better than his Master, Christ promised His chosen ones a large share of the hoarded hatred of the Jews that would inevitably be poured upon them after the Ascension. But His followers were not to court death nor invite it (Matth. x., 23; xxiv., 16; Mark xiii., 14; Luke xxi., 21). The Apostles understood this repeated command and put it into effect by flight from persecution (Matth. xxvi., 56). St. Paul, with that charming open-heartedness which runs through his Epistles like a golden thread of purified and spiritualized individuality, is not ashamed to speak of the flight he was forced, in his turn, to resort to (II. Cor. xi., 32; Hebr. xi., 38). Could the fiery, zealous Apostle forget the days when he was athirst with desire to purge the land of all who did not follow in his footsteps? Now he, too, has drawn upon himself the anger of the populace, and his historian expatiates on the fact with special minuteness (Acts ix., 29, 30; xiii., 51; xvii., 10, 14).

Primitive Christians with the souvenirs of apostolic preaching and example constantly before them seem never to have had a doubt as to the interpretation and application of the words of the Master. Thus when Christ's prophecy concerning the fall of the Royal City was being fulfilled, the faithful living therein fled on Divine command to Pella, a village beyond the Jordan.³ A little later St. Ignatius of Antioch speaks of the Church recovering the glory and integrity of its members on the cessation of Trajan's persecution.⁴ Tillemont⁵ suggests that the holy Bishop refers to those Christians who lived in concealment during those troublous times. About the same time St. Polycarp of Smyrna, whom antiquity loves to call "the Doctor of Asia, the Father of Christians," adds some important testimony on the subject. His words are of great weight, since he is the last accredited witness of apostolic teachings. St. Irenæus says of him⁶ that he never taught anything but what he had learned from the lips of the Apostles. As an octogenarian, and almost in view of the blessed mansions of eternity, he fled twice from impend-

³ Eusebius, H. E. 111, 5; Epiphanius, In Haeres. Naz., 7.

⁴ Funk, Die Apostollische Väter (Tübingen, 1906), 104.

⁵ Memoirs pour servira, II., 203.

⁶ Adv. Haer., P. G. VII., 851.

ing death on the instance of his friends. He finally surrendered himself to his pursuers, but only because he had been betrayed by one of his unfaithful slaves. Hence his words are most significant: "We do not praise those who surrender themselves; the Gospel does not teach that."⁷ And well might he speak thus, for his fatherly heart had been torn at the sight of a young Phrygian, Quintus, who, having freely given himself up to the Judges, renounced the faith in the arena from sheer fear and consternation at the sight of the wild beasts—a lamentable occurrence which conveyed to the people the full import of the holy Bishop's words, so that with one accord all Asia ratified the venerable patriarch's saying in terming him "a martyr according to the Gospel."

Just a few decades later St. Clement of Alexandria made known his mind on flight from persecution. He insists⁸ that martyrdom does not consist in coquetting with death after the manner of the fanatical gymnosopists of India, who freely leap into the fire. Again he says: "When He (Jesus) says, 'When they persecute you in one city, flee to another,' He does not counsel flight as if persecution were an evil thing; nor does He enjoin them to avoid death by flight as if in fear of it, but He wishes us neither to be the authors and abettors of any evil to any one, either to ourselves or the persecutor and murderer."⁹ That these words and many others of like import were not mere dry and formal academic utterances Clement proved later on by his own conduct. For we know from Eusebius¹⁰ that after the edict of Septimus Severus there was none to break the bread of life at Alexandria. Now, as there can be no question of his death at this time, we must infer that the great Doctor, Clement, had abandoned his cathedra in that famous school.

These facts would seem amply sufficient to show that it was generally regarded as licit and advisable to avoid the extremities of Roman legal intolerance. But here we meet Tertullian, who, in a work dealing professedly with the subject, is in open opposition to this teaching of the representative Fathers of the Church. We can never imagine that Tertullian, whose mind of all the apologists was the most dialectical, was unable to grasp the full bearing and limitations of the subject. Before his fall into error the stern African taught that it was not forbidden to flee from persecution. It is better, he says, to flee from city to city than apostatize,¹¹ and on the way man rightly overcomes the inconveniences of journeying.¹²

⁷ Funk, *op. cit.*, 117, v.

⁸ Strom., P. G. VIII., 1231.

⁹ *Ibid.* 1286.

¹⁰ Euseb., H. E. VI., 3.

¹¹ Ad Uxorem iii., P. L. I., 1278.

¹² De Patientia, P. L. I., 1250.

He classes the fleeing David and Jeremiah among the martyrs of the Old Testament.¹³ But at the same time Tertullian seems to prefer confession of the faith and death to flight and safety as being more glorious and more becoming the followers of a persecuted Master. Guignebert is not so far afield in maintaining that the apologist had an inborn and temperamental aversion for all that savored of indulgence to the flesh. But, despite this innate rigorism, he was held in high esteem. An original and daring thinker of his type was sure to exercise an influence, amounting almost to fascination, over many minds still enamored of the austerities of the Stoic philosophy. There is, doubtless, a certain rude nobility in his uncompromising stand, which quickly captured all those pleasure-sated men who looked for an apodictical solution of the unsolvable problems of life. He was consulted, therefore, though a Montanist at the time, by Fabius, one of the faithful, in this wise: "Fugiendum necne sit in persecutione?"¹⁴ Tertullian answered with his "De Fuga in Persecutione."

This treatise is a curious relic. It is a vehement screed wherein violence is done to the accepted moral praxis of the Church. Even the logic of the reply is lacking in the wonted lucidity of the writer's earlier and better days. He reasons thus: Since nothing happens against the will of God, we must be prepared to accept persecution from the Lord as a trial and test of the believer. True, no doubt, the Lord makes use of Satan in trying His faithful servants. Nevertheless, evil does not come from the devil, but only through him. The powers of the archenemy are limited by God. Therefore, as no one can doubt that the Lord sends persecution, no one may of his own device avoid the heaven-ordained ordeal. Even should there be danger of renouncing the faith, the Christian is still obliged to remain in the stronghold of danger. For we are either certain or not certain of denying the faith. If certain of this, then we have already denied "si certus iam negasti;" if not certain, then we must leave the issue in the hands of the Almighty. If He demands of us an open confession we cannot determine otherwise, for "nolle confiteri negare est." If the Lord commanded the Apostles to follow His own example of flight, it was only for that period during which the faith was being preached throughout Judea. Evangelists were needed then who were in full possession of the Divine Founder's ideas.

A certain unsoundness manifests itself in all this fanatical reasoning of Tertullian. As he proceeds, the apologist works himself up

¹³ Ad Scorpion. viii.

¹⁴ P. L. II., 123; Adhemar d'Ales, *La Theologie de Tertullien* (Paris, 1905), 454-460.

into a frenzy of mental exultation. For only in that condition—let us extend him that charitable interpretation at least—could he make the bold assertion that apostasy is preferable to flight—“Pulchrior est miles in proelio transmissus quam in fuga salvus.” Then, like a feacial high priest, he turns to the clergy, giving them advice and instruction with a bitterness which has now, alas! become chronic with him. He recalls the curses of Holy Writ on hirelings. He scorns and rails at the manifest cowardice of such action. He sees no justification for flight. Nor does he approve of the “redemptio” or buying of safety by money offered the Judges. This, he avers, was the act that made Simon the Magician odious. Nay, more, it was a hidden and disguised flight and apostasy, an outrage to the blood of Christ. It were more manly to flee openly than debase life by such chicanery. Reckon on faith, not money, if your presence is necessary for the maintenance of Sunday worship. Though this may be a hard doctrine, yet it is not, for all that, unreasonable, since the way of salvation is narrow.

Tertullian, who had promised so much on his conversion to Christianity, is now found in open rupture with the Church. His efforts to appear orthodox and submissive—as the *Ad Scapulam* showed—are now thrown to the winds. And—sadder still!—in thus going against the doctrine of the Fathers and the practice of the churches, this heretical Christian Stoic and stoical Christian seems to have felt no fear, no regret, no remorse. Even if all authorities¹⁵ did not agree that this, his work, was written after his lapse into Montanism, yet an examination of the text would show that the author hugged close to his heart of hearts some of the pet doctrines of the sect. For the Montanists preached that flight from persecution was a sin against the Holy Ghost; nay, a downright act of defiance. This rigorism fitted in admirably with the strict injunctions to fastings, the eagerness for martyrdom, the teaching regarding the abundance and permanency of the charismata, especially prophecy, the belief in the immediate and constant individual direction of the Paraclete, all of which were to prepare men for the impending second coming of the Divine Judge near Thymium and Papuza.¹⁶ There is all the frenzy of an Oriental worship about this parasitical system introduced into Africa from Phrygia. The Circumcelliones are the full-blown flower of the Montanists. Both show, in their own way, much of the senseless imprudence of Buddhist Yogi. This sect,

¹⁵ Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur* (1904), 11., 279-281; Bardenhewer-Mercati, *Patrologia* (Rome, 1903), I., 231; Freppel, *Tertullien*, I., 286-296.

¹⁶ Belgk, *Geschichte des Montanismus*; Ermoni in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1902.

then, tried to have its canons inserted into the Scriptures.¹⁷ But for the third time this effort at tampering with the Bible was condemned and overthrown by Rome. As this was probably about the year 212, Monceaux¹⁸ is right in saying that the traces of acribia in the "De Fuga" are to be explained on the ground that Tertullian was only venting his spleen at this renewed failure of his co-religionists.

Yet this rigorous teaching, enunciated with such irritating bitterness, was not as harmless as many are inclined to maintain. During the time when the treatise had actual bearing upon their conduct it must have caused much hesitancy and indecision among the faithful. Tertullian had said such noble and worthy things of the "Ecclesia" in his days of orthodoxy that men were still willing and ready to accept his every word as a "testimonium animae naturaliter christiana."¹⁹ Moreover, there are truths in the "De Fuga" which, taken apart from the general thesis, not even the most ultramontane theologian could take exception to. Men's minds were also looking longingly for an end of the "potestates tenebrarum harum." The times were sore for Christian hearts, indeed. Sin abounded—a true "iniquitas in excelsis." Heresy was rampant. It paraded in the white robes of sanctity. The State, too, was in painful straits. The mammoth engine that had ruthlessly run down the autonomy of every State was beginning to fall to pieces. Pestilence was striking down thousands in cities and fields. Superstition, pagan excesses, suspicion were calling to new life and increased vigor the worst fanaticism of the mob. Why, then, did Christ defer His second coming? Had He not promised an early return as the Reformer and Avenger of all these ills? If the Master tarried, was death for Him not a boon in such times? Did not thousands of noble-minded pagans, moved by what Seneca in his twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth epistles called the "libido moriendi," depart from this tragedy of life by an exit that not even the most senseless Christian sect would choose? Really the clear white vision that Hermas saw seemed to beckon the sad and weary to quit this abode of darkest woe. Who would maintain, even from motives of prudence, that the Christian should evade the Crucified as He appeared in the great broad road of life demanding sacrifices of all? Thoughts and temptations such as these are not peculiar to that age alone. And, for one reason or another, that epoch elicited an intensity of faith and earnestness of resolve quite in excess of those of any other age. In the works of the apologist, therefore, there are to be found many

¹⁷ Zahn, *Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Kanons*, 3-57.

¹⁸ *Histoire de l'Afrique chretienne*.

¹⁹ *Apol.* 17.

scattered phrases expressive of the expectation of the "Parousia."²⁰ Hence it is not the least glory of the Fathers that in the midst of this fiery furnace of spiritual excitement and religious delirium they possessed themselves in peace and counseled a course of action flatly opposed to the frenzied dictates of the heretics. The ballast of prudence is ever with the Fathers.

The powerful words of the African could not bewilder or mislead an Origen or a St. Cyprian, both of whom professed the warmest admiration for the erratic apologist. Be it because he was so voluminous a writer or because the condition of affairs demanded a full treatment of the subject, it remains true that Origen has much to say on the question of flight from persecution. With Tertullian he maintains that the words of Scripture advising flight were addressed to the Apostles. But the Alexandrine master goes further. Since all are brothers in Christ, these words must also apply to the faithful of all times.²¹ The soldier of Christ should avoid the necessity of confessing the faith by flight if he feel that he would not be strong enough to stand the test, or that it would be to his disadvantage. This is the true meaning underlying the words of St. Matthew x., 23.²² When there is an opportunity of flight it is temerity not to flee.²³ It is praiseworthy, moreover, to flee for two reasons. First, because we can never know the issue of the trial; secondly, because we can thus avoid aggravating the guilt of the pagan Judge. For every man shall be held to account for causing his neighbor's sin. Now, the faithful cause sin when they force the Judge to summon them to trial. This is true especially when no advantage to the faith would result from confession or when no injury would befall the Christian cause by flight. If our Lord fled under similar circumstances, it was evidently for our instruction.²⁴ Celsus assures Origen²⁵ that it was scandalous in the eyes of the pagan to find the Nazarene outwitting His enemies when snares were laid to entrap Him. With the fine sense of the historian and with a lawyer's ready wit Origen answered in the spirit of the Stagyrite. For if men praise Aristotle because he left Athens lest an injury be offered to philosophy,²⁶ could Christ not save Himself from the fate that befell Socrates? Was the Christian cause not infinitely higher? Origen, too, though the son of a martyr and aflame from youth with a consuming desire for the martyr's crown,

²⁰ D'Ales, *op. cit.*, 446-448.

²¹ *Exhort. ad Mart.*, P. G. XI., 606.

²² P. G. XII., 988.

²³ P. G. XIII., 897.

²⁴ P. G. XIV., zw1 728 sq.

²⁵ P. G. XI., 782.

²⁶ Arist. *Frag.* 654 (Heitz), iv., II., 327.

escaped death in 203 under Septimus Severus by hiding in Palestine.²⁷ Palladius²⁸ says that for two years he lay concealed in the house of the holy virgin, Julia of Cæsarea.

After the advent of Decius to the throne a new and tangible justification of the Christian's flight from death can be found. The new Emperor was aware of the firm root that Christianity had taken in the empire. The insensate rage of his royal predecessors had proved wholly ineffectual. The "gens malefica" of Suetonius won new adherents every day among the conservative caste of the aristocracy. The Christians were no longer a "gens lucifuga et latebrosa," but had churches throughout the empire, and occasionally erected monuments to the dear departed ones no longer in the Catacombs, but above ground. We can get a fair idea of the influence of the so-called "superstitio exitiabilis" of Tacitus when we remember that the Roman Pontiff was a personage of such considerable importance that Decius preferred hearing of the revolt of a rival pretender rather than of the election of a Bishop of Rome.²⁹ How, then, was this arrogant Emperor—who is an excellent prototype of the later Byzantine royal theologians—how was he to stay the growth of the Church? By a decree issued in A. D. 250 he ordered all Christians to appear on summons before the tribunals to offer incense to the gods.³⁰ The Lapsi of the Carthaginian Church betrayed much spiritual weakness and coldness. That the more fervent of the faithful, however, a veritable band of confessors, fled when the stringent edict was posted in the fora of the Roman world, any one can learn from the three introductory paragraphs of St. Cyprian's book, "De Lapsis." The Bishop speaks in the highest terms of those faithful and prudent souls. Most eloquently he portrays a father's heart running over with justifiable pride at beholding such multiplied manifestations of Christian wisdom and heroism.

Nor are the references in the letters of the Carthaginian Bishop less explicit. So many of his ecclesiastics had preceded the Bishop into exile that he complains³¹ of not having sufficient clergy around him to carry out decently the sacred rites of the Church. Yielding to the earnest and insistent solicitations of his friends,³² Cyprian left the city betimes, in company with several of his friends.³³ This action aroused the dissatisfaction of a small contingent of his clergy, who accused their chief pastor of fear and cowardice. Just how far

²⁷ Euseb., *H. E.* VI., 3, 4, 5.

²⁸ *Historia Lausiaca* (ed. Butler), II., 160.

²⁹ Cyprian, *Epistola LII.*

³⁰ Ep. Gregg, *The Decian Persecution*, 72-75.

³¹ Ep. XXIX., XXX.

³² Ep. XX., 1.

³³ Ep. V., 2; VII.

these clerics were influenced by the obstinate sympathizers of Tertullian, who, if we may believe St. Augustine,³⁴ had formed themselves into a body called the "Tertullianists," is hard to say. The influence of these sectaries was about this time almost defunct. At any rate, all the existing epistles of St. Cyprian are interlarded with direct or indirect references as with mild retorts to these accusations, insinuations and murmurs of the disaffected and overzealous clergy. St. Cyprian is at pains to explain his position, not so much in order to exculpate himself as to show upon what motives he had abandoned the sure death that threatened him in his episcopal city. He fled, he says, lest his presence should inflame the blood of his enemies to anger and drive them to the abuse of religion.³⁵ Nay, by vision from heaven³⁶ he had placed himself under the painful necessity of eating in a foreign land the bitter bread of banishment.³⁷ But these meddlesome, self-satisfied critics were too proud to see and understand the saving common sense, as also the puissant, hidden anguish concealed in these letters of their pastor. So they wrote to Rome. Owing to the death by martyrdom of Pope Fabius, it was an easy task for the African clergy, with their tale of complaint, to win the ear of the Roman priests. The answer of these latter, which Aube describes in true yet no very flattering³⁸ terms, is a downright, though diplomatically cautious condemnation of Cyprian's conduct. But the Bishop was not to be so easily talked down. At once he wrote two letters to Rome. In the second, which especially concerns the matter in hand, he shows that by flight he had merely obeyed our Lord's commands; that he sought safety and immunity from harm not for himself, but for his flock; that though in concealment, he was, nevertheless, in close and constant touch with all ecclesiastical affairs at Carthage.³⁹ This epistle had the desired effect, and the Roman priests retracted by letter all the calumnies against Cyprian that had gained ground among them. They declared, moreover, that nothing reprehensible could be found in his conduct.⁴⁰ Whilst these letters exercised an immense influence on the people at large, we find the same commendation of flight from danger in the more official writings of the saintly Bishop. It is worthy of note that in Cyprian's very treatise, where disloyalty to the Master is

³⁴ *De Haer.*, 86.

³⁵ *Ep. V.*, 7; *XIV.*

³⁶ *Ep. XVI.*, 4.

³⁷ It may be interesting to know how St. Dionysius of Alexandria reasoned on this point: ". . . nunquam mea sponte nec sine Dei nutu cum Deus mihi ut alio migrarem *praecipi* potest."

³⁸ *L'Eglise et l'Etat dans la II. moitié du III. siècle*, 83, says it possessed "un terrible fiel sous sa douceur sucree."

³⁹ *Ep. XX.*

⁴⁰ *EP. XXX.*

branded as it should be, we find some of the most decided praises of flight. "The first step to glory consists in confessing the Lord on falling into the hands of the Gentiles; the second step is to withdraw by a cautious retirement in order to be reserved for the Lord. The former is a public, the latter a private confession. The former overcomes the Judge of this world, the latter, satisfied with God as its Judge, keeps a pure conscience in integrity of heart. The former confessor as his hour approached was found mature in faith; the latter, perhaps, was delayed because he would not deny Christ, but he would certainly have confessed Him if he, too, had been apprehended."⁴¹ How exquisitely beautiful and delicate are the sentiments expressed in these words of holy Cyprian. Christ is the companion of the exile,⁴² who by flight has not renounced the faith, but only deferred its recompense.⁴³ Rightly does he call the refugee a good soldier, "bonus miles,"⁴⁴ since he suffers what the Lord ordains, not choosing by self-surrender what he himself desires.⁴⁵

The same doctrine was promulgated in the Orient by many of the Fathers. Restricting ourselves to St. Gregory of Nyssa, we find him implore the faithful to conceal themselves, for the present, since they were not strong enough in the faith, he feared, to bear persecution gloriously.⁴⁶ The great Doctor fled himself from impending evil in order to approve his teaching by example. The Lord seems to have manifested His approbation of this step and of the like conduct, later on, of Sts. Athanasius and Paulinus.⁴⁷ Tillemont⁴⁸ suggests that the Almighty ratified the conduct of Cyprian and Gregory in a visible manner as an argument against the Montanists.

Nowhere, however, do we see a clearer or more practical application of this doctrine of the Fathers than in the penitential canons of Peter of Alexandria, which were promulgated on Easter Sunday A. D. 306. They are a systematic resumé of all the previous teachings on this question scattered up and down the many tomes of the Fathers. In this valuable document,⁴⁹ which is no faint foreshadowing of the mediæval soul directories and books of penance, each offense is briefly stated and the penalty which seemed necessary affixed. And well might the zealous Bishop direct his attention to the bettering of the ecclesiastical status of many of his spiritual children, for in the Alexandrine Church many had gone over, as into

⁴¹ *De Lapsis*, 3.

⁴² *Ep. XLVIII.*, 4.

⁴³ *De Lapsis*, 10.

⁴⁴ *Ep. XLVIII.*, 4.

⁴⁵ *EP. XXXVIII.*

⁴⁶ *P. G. XLVI.*, 584.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, III., 322.

⁴⁹ *P. G. XVIII.*, 480 sq.

the arms of a Moloch, to the base practices of the pagan cults. The short breathing space made possible by the accession of Maximin Daia was embraced as a propitious hour for the internal reform of the long-suffering Church. The great Mother's heart was still indulgent, and the rod was used only because it was necessary. Hence we notice that masters who had constrained their slaves to offer to the idols when these latter might have hidden themselves, and thus retained the faith, were to perform public penance during three years.⁵⁰ Clerics who had surrendered themselves to the Judges and subsequently apostatized were deprived of their priestly offices, whilst those who had not gone the utter length of denial were to be punished for their rashness.⁵¹ In the same place we find an unmistakable condemnation of those who had provoked the pagan mob by breaking down their temples and idols.⁵² This fearless prelate fled later on,⁵³ thus sealing by example what he had so courageously counseled in others.

Naught save an insidious inference fraught at once with colossal ignorance and habitual perversion of the mind and teaching of the Fathers could dare maintain that they advised flight when open and courageous profession of the faith was a plain duty. This witness-ing to the faith was precisely one of the essentials for a martyr's honor and title. If God intervened, asking flight rather than death, as happened with the Prince of the Apostles, it would, of course, be criminal obstinacy and self-sufficiency not to flee. But capture and imprisonment were generally taken as certain indications of a Christian's duty to confess the faith. St. Polycarp went gladly to the pyre when he deemed it the will of the Master made known to him by his capture through the betrayal by one of his servants. St. Cyprian embraced martyrdom with as much eagerness as any mediæval saint ever manifested for the approach of the grim though comely "Sister Death." Though he had several times evaded the talons of the Roman eagle, yet when captured he calmly awaited the decisive blow. Nay, during the year of captivity preceding his death, when flight was possible owing to the freedom of Roman detention or "custodia libera,"⁵⁴ he never embraced the chance of

⁵⁰ P. G. XVIII., 480, canon vii.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 4888.

⁵² The Council of Iberis (canonix) deprived of the title of martyr those who had provoked the pagans to anger by destroying their temples. Lactantius (*De Morte, Persec.*, cxili.) blames a Christian of Nicomedia, who had torn down a penal edict. Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.*, IV., xxix.) blames Bishop Abdas, of Persia, for wrecking a heathen temple. Instances of such rebukes abound.

⁵³ Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, P. G. LXVII., 1166.

⁵⁴ The "custodia libera" in Roman law was a sort of parole, which often extended over several years. The prisoner was entrusted to the hands of a citizen, who was responsible with his life for the custody of the captive. Paul, *Sententia*, I, v., c. xxxi., Sidon *Apoli.* Ep., 1, 7.

escape. Here, then, is one of the limitations governing the permission granted the confessors to flee from the hands of the persecutor. Self-surrender is heretical as betraying a distrust of the Creator;⁵⁵ it is forbidden by the Apostolic Constitutions⁵⁶ and precludes the title of martyr. But if a Christian has actually been seized, then his plain duty is to bear witness to Christ with courage and confidence.⁵⁷ It is, moreover, proper not to postpone the confession of faith if circumstances demand it.⁵⁸ Any one at all familiar with the writings of the Fathers knows that the dominating spirit of the seven beautiful treatises, "Exhortationes ad Martyres," enjoins a valiant, steadfast and unequivocal confession of Christ by those whom the praying faithful touchingly called "martyres destinati." These latter were no other than the brethren held fast in prison, from which they were not allowed to escape save by direct inspiration or Divine intervention. It were an easy task to ferret out of the writings of that day many exhortations to constancy uttered by the sympathizing and half-envious "pastores fidelesque" who were not yet deemed worthy to stand in the vestibule of heaven, as the dungeons of prospective martyrs were rightly considered, despite their noisome hideousness. Nowadays such classification would be looked upon as the useless work of a mediæval historical scavenger.

In those days of bitter trial the early Christians learned the Divine will in their regard from a careful study of the Gospel of St. Matthew, where the most direct command to flight stands side by side with the Master's instructions to His disciples regulating their conduct when brought before Judges, Governors and Kings for His name's sake. It was the chosen *vade mecum* of many a hunted confessor of the faith; it was the most ardently desired gift of the incarcerated Christian. In the dim light of the dingy, damp and noisome cell it was most frequently read to the holy prisoner by the aged priest or the youthful deacon whose eyes were alike quick to discover danger. Here was the word of God giving solace to those for whom escape was no longer possible, and sober directions for flight for those whom the law had not as yet apprehended. No wonder, then, that the *Acta Martyrum* are saturated with the spirit

⁵⁵ Clement Alex. Strom., IV., 4.

⁵⁶ Apost. Const. (ed. Funk), V., 3; VIII., 45. Even if we are disposed to consider the Apostolic Constitutions with Funk, as interpenetrated with Apollinaristic spirit, yet the testimony they offer regarding flight is in no wise impaired. For in a matter as public as this they could not have been in opposition to a doctrine so well known to the faithful.

⁵⁷ Origin O., XIII., 897. The heretical sect of the Helcisaites taught that when dragged before the tribunal the faithful might deny by word whilst maintaining the true faith in their hearts. Euseb., H. E. VI., xxxviii.; Origen, Com. Cel., I., 1; Basil, Hom. in Gordian. Martyr., xviii.

of those words written only about six years after Christ's Ascension. No wonder that the confessor's responses to the crafty questions of a Roman Judge are often almost verbatim quotations from that self-same Gospel of St. Matthew, as Le Blant has adequately shown.⁵⁹ Truly, "dabitur vobis in illa hora quid loquamini"—and those heroic confessors spoke with the manly courage and fearlessness of him who is often called the "Praeceptor Martyrum."

Another point which cannot be overlooked unless we are prepared to allow the interpretation of history to the enemies of the faith comes up naturally for consideration at this place. We have seen Tertullian inveighing against the flight of the clergy. Failing to make the necessary distinctions and reservations of wiser and more prudent interpreters, he condemned flight indiscriminately. His doctrine, however, was repudiated even by so devoted an admirer as St. Cyprian. Indeed, most of the prominent ecclesiastics of the era of persecution condemned his attitude either by word or action. Yet none of these uncompromising teachers meant to justify a reckless or concerted flight of the clergy. Even so early as the first year of the Christian dispensation the Catholic priest by his commendable devotion to his flock, by

the better fortitude
Of patience, and heroic martyrdom
Unsung,⁶⁰

won the love and confidence enduring to this present day. If, on the one hand, a layman could not surrender himself to the authorities save in atonement for previous apostasy,⁶¹ on the other, no priest could absent himself without grave and serious reasons. In the year 250 St. Cyprian deprived two sub-deacons and an acolyte, who had fled without sufficient reason, of the monthly stipend assigned the ministers of the altar.⁶² Two years later he admonished⁶³ his flock to rally around the priests, who had been instructed as to the manner of opposing the impending outbreak of violence. These are two instances of many that show the practice prevailing throughout the Church. Enough of the clergy perished nobly at the post of duty when flight was not permissible, and thus saved the sacred calling from being justly considered mercenary. St. Augustine gives us the *praxis* prescribed in his day for the clergy. His words are only the explicit and theological statement of a point of pastoral theology which had obtained always and everywhere before his time. Without special reason, he says, none can desert the flock. If like

⁵⁹ Le Blant, *op. cit.*

⁶⁰ Milton, *Parad. Lost*, ix., 29.

⁶¹ Cyp. Ep. XVII.; Pet. Alex., canon viii.

⁶² Ep. XXIV., 4.

⁶³ Ep. LVII., 2.

danger threaten both priest and layman, the former cannot abandon the faithful. But if the priest is singled out as a target, if his parish has migrated elsewhere to regions of safety, if a substitute can be found to administer the sacraments in secret without arousing fears of pagan suspicion, then only might the priest withdraw from his charge.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, it would seem from his comments that the great Doctor was not altogether certain about the obligation of flight. At any rate, he maintains, it is not unlawful to flee.⁶⁵ Even at such times and under such restrictions as those he indicated, the zealous priests departed reluctantly. Never for a moment did the pastor utterly desert his flock. A substitute, whose identity was not known to the Roman authorities, was generally installed in his place. These were the "commissaries," of whom we find early mention, especially in the life of Peter of Alexandria.⁶⁶

And thus, thanks be to God, prudence and devotion to duty closely united in those primitive days. The vision of ravenous beasts or torturing rack did not deprive the Church of her divine tranquillity and serenity, nor disturb the imperturbable equity of her judgment, the decisions of her temperate tribunal of wise spiritual direction. She was too intimately the Spouse of Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace and the Ruler of the World, to turn pale and timorous when the stormy elements of passion and cruel intolerance raged about her. Like the mother of the Machabees, she never flinched in sacrificing her beloved sons to truth and duty. She alone is the martyr of the ages; yea, the great mother of all martyrs. But, on the other hand, the Spirit of Wisdom and Truth, the promised Paraclete coming to her aid, had ever guided her safely through the dangerous shoals of Montanistic illuminism and the premature Jansenism of the Gnostic Areopagitae. She always stood unchanging and immovable as the Everlasting Rock whereon she was builded—too strong to be blown hither and thither by every gust of persecution and every breath of carnal wisdom, counseling accommodation to the spirit of the world; too motherly to demand heroic and super-human sacrifice from every one in every instance. Hence the rights and duties of her children in penal times worked mightily towards good on a corrupt and evil generation—on a dissolute and sycophantic paganism. A respecter of law and order, as had been her Divine Founder, she allowed her children to adopt the legal means of escape from death sanctioned by the Roman law. The noblest of her sons did not disdain juridical appeal and procedure. "Ego sum civis Romanus" is the bold cry of the justice-loving

⁶⁴ Ep. ad Honorat., P. L. XXX., 111, 1013 sq.

⁶⁵ P. L. XLII., 272.

⁶⁶ Hefele, *History of Councils*, I., 343-344.

Apostle of the Gentiles. But the illegal means of escape, such as the false certificate (*libellus*) and substitution (*missio*), she most certainly proscribed, despite the false theology of the crafty "libellatichi" and the subtle "mittentes." Rebellion was never encouraged or fomented by her children with ecclesiastical approbation, despite the blundering statements to that effect of subsequent historians.⁶⁷ Flight and ransom were allowed, we know, under certain conditions. From all this⁶⁸ it appears as clear as daylight that life was a sacred boon to men who always carried it in their hands. Only the sinister, malevolent pen of untrustworthy historians, pledged to offset the authoritative claims to true greatness of the Church and her children, can depict the Catholic priesthood of primitive times as cowardly, unfaithful and lacking in devotion to their flocks. Only a sentimental, sensational corps of so-called historians can question or find fault with the disciplinary regulations of the Church in penal days. If the early Christians possessed a single spark of that vain-glorious ambition, that effeminate posing before a pagan world which the infidel Gibbon sets forth in the twenty-third chapter (Part III.) of his work as the motive which sustained the martyrs and steeled them to their fate, we would never have had so many examples of flight from apostasy nor of so many noble martyrs who stood fast to the post of duty to the end. Flight to Gibbon—that arch-enemy of Christianity—meant all that was inglorious and cowardly; death, because of the conditions and obligations attendant on a particular state of life, was the only alternative, the only manner of making the best of an endless and hopeless situation.

II.

The most cursory glance through the *Acta Sanctorum* or the *Acta Sincera Martyrum* of Ruinart discovers to us a legion of worthy children of Mother Church who fled on the outbreak of every persecution.⁶⁹ By the hard schooling of exile some of the extores were found firm and sure enough of foot when God's will clearly manifested itself to step down on the arena and combat boldly for the golden and beauteous crown of actual martyrdom. But the Church did not withhold the martyr's glory and privilege from those confessors of whom the rare Dominican apologist, Ansaldi, speaks in his valuable and interesting work, "De Martyribus sine Sanguine."⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Benigni, *Storia Sociale della Chiesa* (Milan, 1907), I., 249, note 2.

⁶⁸ Benigni, *op. cit.*, 236-249.

⁶⁹ Jolyon, *op. cit.*, *passim*. The monumental work of Paul Allard, "Histoire des Persecutions" (five volumes), contains many examples of flight.

⁷⁰ This valuable work can be read with immense profit at this day, and is published in Ugolino, "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum" (Venice, 1756).

In giving these valiant defenders of the faith the much coveted honor, the Church has been guided by the canon which St. Athanasius recalled to the minds of the faithful of his day, "Those who die in flight do not die without glory, for theirs is the palm of martyrdom."⁷¹ The martyr of the weaker sex, St. Theckla, around whose name the Christian imagination has woven an almost impenetrable veil of legend, died peacefully at Leleucia after having sustained many enforced flights in the wake of St. Paul's retreating steps.⁷² Around the brows of countless others the halo of martyrdom shone resplendently when the hour of a natural death approached. For, though from the third century onward the title of martyr was used in the strictest sense of those only who had suffered death for the faith, yet during the days of actual conflict it was often applied to those who did not succumb outright to the persecutor's violence.⁷³ This is evident from the fact that the extores exercised an intercessory power in behalf of the renegade and apostate Christian. There is no question, nor could there be, of the martyrs who were already following the Lamb in the heavenly Jerusalem. Hence whatever obscurity shrouds the interpretation of Tertullian's words, it is certain that he speaks⁷⁴ of those witnesses of the faith who were still among the living for whom the extores exercised the good offices of mediators and intercessors. Besides, the early writers did not apply the term of martyr to the extores in that special sense adopted by St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Alphons Liguori and spiritual writers in general, when they compared the sacrifice of the monk to that of the martyr. Nor were the refugees termed martyrs in the poetical sense of the mediaeval Celts who distinguished the "red martyr" who sheds his blood for Christ from the "white martyr" who lives the life of purity, or the "green martyr" who walks on the royal road of penitential suffering.⁷⁵ No, the fugitives suffered pains enough to warrant the glorious honors given them. The prospect which stared them in the face as they wistfully departed into a sorrowful and uncertain exile was not by any means inviting or inspiriting.

There was, first of all, the appalling thought of leaving home. The stoutest heart is not proof against this shaft of sorrow. And

⁷¹ *Apol. pro Fuga sua*, P. G. XXV., 666.

⁷² Cabrol, *Le Légend de sainte Thècle*, in *Gethsemane et le Monde* (1895). Also published in brochure.

⁷³ Cyprian, *Ep. LVI.*; Baronius *Not. in Mar. Rom. ad 2m Januarii*; Benedict XIV., *De Serv. Beat.*; Piolin, *La Vindication ou la reconnaissance authentique du martyre par l'Eglise*, in *Revue du Monde Catholique* (1889), 375-392.

⁷⁴ *Ad Mart. I.*, . . . quam pacem quidem in ecclesia non habentes a martyribus in carcere exorare consueverunt.

⁷⁵ Goyaud, *Les Conceptions du martyre chez les Irlandais*, in *Revue Benedictine* (July, 1907), 336-359.

the early Christian, with the waters of baptism still fresh upon his brow and the hideous pagan past receding swiftly before eyes that had seen the salvation of the Lord, was loath to leave the tender seductions of the fireside, now a thousand times sweeter and holier since Christ had stooped to enter in and sup with him at his table. For if the pagan was unstable in his affections, and consequently a vagabond, it was no doubt because the flower of genuine home life, with its deep virginal affection, did not sprout at his hearthstone from the bitter sterile root of ethnicism. The prevalence of divorce in Roman society shows clearly that the sturdy and lustful soldier knew not the most elemental joys of home. No wonder, then, that the exile felt half of life's happiness gone when he took the road of flight in answer to the cruel edict of a heartless Emperor or a conscienceless Senate. Well might St. Cyprian style him a valiant and worthy soldier who preferred to follow the "Incomparable Captain" rather than remain at home with parents or family at the cost of apostasy.⁷⁶ If there were some who had remained behind him on the field of persecution, the extorris was hourly tortured by the racking remembrance of the danger to which his dear ones were constantly exposed. Father or mother might be standing that very hour before some inhuman Judge who had no respect for age or virtue; wife or sister might be struggling helplessly in the clutches of some foul ruffian, who, tearing them away from the pure home where they abode with Jesus, was about to consign them to the pestilential confines of a brothel. Tender infants, perhaps, were that moment sending forth their pitiful cries on the desert air near Lake Velabrum, by the Aventine, or at the Lactaria column, where defenseless babes were abandoned; or perchance the modest young spouse, fair as she was chaste, was being forced to take part in the vile performances of the vaudeville stage, worse than the orgies of hell itself. Again, if, as often happened, an edict was promulgated suddenly, like a bolt of lightning from the blue, and there was no time to arrange a concerted flight, family ties were torn asunder and the mangled, dissevered parts scattered like chaff before the wind. The tender, plaintive threnody of *Evangeline* of later days can be found foreshadowed in the *Acta* of those early ages. The keen eye can read between the lines of every one of these monumental histories of eviction the whole sad tragedy of broken hearts, bleeding wounds and pining, lonesome, homesick families. No doubt that note of ideal melancholy, soft and sorrowful as the plaint of the dove, which throbs through the earliest literature of nearly every Christian nation, was caught from the *Acta Martyrum*, which, far from enervating the heroes of the Middle Ages, presented to

them rather a glorious incentive to Gospel living and courage. The Mysteries and Miracle Plays of Europe, even when they seem least occupied with the story of the martyrs, cannot altogether put aside the elevating tenderness of those primal tragedies of Christian literature.

Then, too, the Roman citizen certainly was passionately devoted to his fatherland. Nor was the Christian less loyal patriot, despite the calumny of "contemptissimae inertiae" wherewith Suetonius would fain have defiled his honor. Biglmaier has shown, in his valuable monograph on the subject, that the early Christians participated in all those civic movements which did not entail a practical renunciation of their faith. Therefore, to roam about, an exile among savages, far removed from the privileges which Roman law and Roman institutions secured to the Christian and pagan alike meant no small anguish to the former. Apart from all this, what man could ever experience the fascinating spell of the City Eternal and feel quite at home in any other place? Even the motley throng of her bitterest enemies, her mongrel stepchildren of every clime, the Golden City subdued by an easy, spontaneous, unconscious and all-compelling charm. From her statesmen, too, and her officials Rome elicited a chivalric devotion which no other city could duplicate. Regulus, Cincinnatus and Coriolanus are typical and symbolical Roman heroes. And so, in "Hypathia"—that violent yet impotent hiss of the serpent scotched by the Tractarian movement of England—Kingsley gives us a true soul-picture of the statesman, Arsenius, depicting him as always dominated by a loyal Roman's high devotion to the "civitas." The state official turned monk can never forget the city he had helped to steer on the wild sea of state-craft. And yet he left it after much thought and premeditation. What, then, of those Christians who were haplessly dispersed without warning? Must not their thoughts have wandered back to the city which had hated and persecuted them, but which they loved with the noblest affection of an exile and a patriot? Did not the Apostle of the Gentiles himself often recall the golden city with its forests of statues, its rows of palatial residences, its brilliant life and busy idleness whither the Master had despatched His chosen Apostle when he tried to escape to Antioch from the hideous sight of all this gilded, refined corruption? Here would be established in the times to come the seat of the new religion's power and majesty; here was to reign the august Vicar of Christ, the mighty general who would safely direct the armies of that Leader of Men whom the Jews condemned to the ignominious death of the Cross as a vile malefactor and open enemy of Cæsar. Here the streets would be baptized in the blood of the martyrs; here the very roads would be worn away

by the ever-passing feet of palmer and penitent. Every stone in that city would take on a tongue to cry aloud against the mummeries of the pagan cult, now so proud and yet so dominant, a foul and idolatrous cult, which had proved itself utterly insufficient for man's higher needs or proper development. Apostles and their coadjutors would come for counsel and direction to "Rome, the nurse of judgment" (Henry VIII. ii., 2). Truly, the primitive Christians tenderly loved the pagan city, which even in their day was fast becoming the "patria fidelium." Tertullian, with his wonted originality, invented a classical barbarism—Romanitas—which epitomized the adage *Omnia Romanae cedant miracula terrae*, then consciously felt by every man from the Tiber to the Danube, from England to the far-flung frontier of Parthia. Hardly had the faithful emerged from the Catacombs in the bowels of the earth, scarcely had the extores returned forever from exile on the publication of the peace won at *Saxa Rubra*, than their hearts gave vent to a burst of enthusiastic admiration for Rome which prudence had forced them hitherto to suppress deeply in their heart of hearts. Jean Guiraud has written a beautiful essay on this, the Christian's loyal love for the municipality. It was in the fifth century, when the wounds of prolonged persecution had hardly healed, that the Christian patriot burst forth in a eulogy which seven centuries later Dante was to put into classic metre:

Figlia e madre d'eroi, che in pace e in guerra
Sempre sul l'Universo avrai l'impero

Roma, che sei de' Numi emula in terra

Con lo splendor de' Cesari e di Piero.

Innanzi a te quando in follie non erra
Sorgi a verti l'attonito pensiero;

Innanzi a te l'ossequio mio s'attera

Che in te sol veggio il grande, il bello, il vero.

Il tempo, che qualunque umana altezza

Transforma, trugge e alfin copre d'obblo

Ti guarda si ma il tuo poter non spezza.

Sull' Aventin, dove a seder si pose

Dante un giorno cosi gridar s'udio:

E: Sia cosi! l'Eternita rispose.

And five centuries later the same cry is heard in the land of Innisfail from the fiery lips of Follian:

O Roma nobilis, orbis et domina,
Cunctarum urbium excellentissima.

This glorious vision of his native city floated frequently before the eyes of the wandering exile. It is not strange, indeed, that the thought of encountering wild countries and savage peoples affrighted the extores. Some, indeed, succumbed under the moral ordeal of bidding farewell indefinitely to home and country. The "insignes personae"⁷⁷ who preferred to remain at home are proof of this.

⁷⁷ *Epistolae cleri Romani ad clerum Carth., inter Cyprianicas*, 2.

There were other obstacles which prevented the Christian from treading the broad basaltic streets leading from the great and gaily throbbing heart of the civilized world. These affect men more intimately. For that innate selfishness of the human heart, which begets a desire for ease and material prosperity, ill sustains the blasting of its fondest dreams and hopes. Hence the loss of property and possessions, the "jactura patrimonii"⁷⁸ was the last condition that the natural man cared to encounter. The Roman law confiscated all the goods and temporalities of the refugee if he failed to return within a year.⁷⁹ The concessions which Caracalla had made in this regard were abrogated by Decius in his edict of 250.⁸⁰ And later, when Valerian came to the throne, he found the State on the verge of financial bankruptcy. The national coffers must be refilled at all costs. Persecution, in this way, became a crusade of organized robbery to enrich the authorities at the expense of a despised and hated sect.⁸¹ Whatever the motives which elicited the second penal decree of Valerian, by which the possessions of Senators, nobles, knights "cæsariani" and noble ladies were confiscated, it is certain that the losses sustained by the Christians at large were not small nor insignificant. Once more they took the sorrowful road of exile. Well did they know that persecution was as it were an intermittent fever. When some rich merchant or legalized brigand with swollen money bags got the favorable chance he would buy or bribe his way to the throne. The real welfare of the commonwealth was to him and his supporters a matter of little or no concern. This was his day of golden indifference; this his hour of purple pomp and bestial carousing. Money alone was needed for this perpetual carnival, this never-ceasing bacchanalian orgy. As time wore on and the royal robbers somewhat relaxed their vigilance, could not the wanderer (one might ask) return, like a migratory bird, to the home he had been forced to abandon? Could he not establish himself again therein with the poor remains he had been able to save from the wreck of his earthly possessions? Not so! For the ravenous wolf of Rome had already devoured greedily the thousand minor patrimonies of the persecuted Christians which had been sacrosanct and inviolable from immemorial times in Roman jurisprudence.⁸² Hence the "rei familiaris damna," which occurs again and again in St. Cyprian's writings, was a powerful deterrent for the Christian who

⁷⁸ Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, 20; Le Blant, *op. cit.*, 229-234.

⁷⁹ L-5 (Digest LXLVIII., tit. xviii., Mandatis vavetur, et si redierint et se purgaverint integrum rem suam habeant. Si neque responderint neque qui se defendant habuerint, tum post annum bona in fiscum coguntur.

⁸⁰ Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, II., 3; Ep. LXI.; Euseb., H. E. VIII., II., 18; Gregg, *op. cit.* *Passim*—and for confiscation of Cyprian's goods, 119.

⁸¹ Cyprian, Ep. LXXXIII., 1.

⁸² Callistratus, *Dig.* XLVIII., *xxi.*; Paul, *ibid.*, 7, 3.

was forced to choose between future penury or flight, between death or denial of the faith. Hence, too, the loss of dignity, the "dignitate amissa," the mention of which we meet with so often in the documents of that day speaks volumes for the living faith and generous sacrifice of its victims.

These, however, were not the worst trials. The conditions of banishment might well shake the courage of the bravest heart. When one considers the uncertainty of obtaining food and shelter; the long journeys undertaken in haste and often by night; the hiding in desert places and caves; the imminent danger from prowling wild beasts; the constant exposure to the elements or to the attacks of bandits and roaming marauders who set themselves like demons to prey upon and enslave the half-starved wanderers⁸³—the catalogue of woes which beset the fleeing Christian might be stretched out to an indefinite length of anguish. In the far-off lands and rural districts to which the victims fled their fellow-Christians were few in number and always difficult to identify. They were considered and punished as accomplices in crime if they welcomed and sheltered the unhappy strangers.⁸⁴ Most of them were poor, being of the few willing and conscientious taxpayers to the extravagant demands of that luxurious cosmopolis by the tawny Tiber that gathered in her resources wherever she could, only to lavish them all as a soothing sop or narcotic upon a proletariat always ripe for sedition and revolution. Besides, when hounded by his persecutors the fugitive was bound to surrender himself rather than betray his host.⁸⁵ The story of St. Arcadius, or the holy deacon Habib of Edessa⁸⁶ alone proves that the exiles were never quite safe in their hiding places. For the State with a malicious cruelty had entered the names of the refugees on the list of the public criminals.⁸⁷ Branded thus, the poor victim was continually exposed to capture in the provinces at the hands of the Roman "strator" or detective. St. Cyprian says that the escaped hid in "latebris nostris," and this was a precaution consequent on flight. We know from the Acts that Sts. Polycarp, Gregory of Neocæsaria, Dionysius of Alexandria, Quirinus, Severus and the three sisters, Agape, Chiona and Irene,⁸⁸ were pursued by the Roman police, who had all to hope from the arrest of the Christians. And often enough the fugitive, alas! fell into the hands of these merciless and avaricious men. St. Domnina sprang into a

⁸³ Euseb., H. E. VI., 42; Cyprian, Ep. LIV.; Ep. LVI.

⁸⁴ Tertullian, *Apologet.* C., ii.

⁸⁵ Pet. Alex., Canon VIII., xlvi. This law does not appear to have been over-rigidly observed.

⁸⁶ Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (1864), 72 sq.; Duval, *La Literature Syriaque*, 127 sq.

⁸⁷ L, 1, 2; Dig. LXLVIII.

⁸⁸ Allard, *Histoire des Perse.*, IV., 278.

river with her two children to avoid capture by these subaltern and underpaid hounds of Roman injustice. With these few instances in mind, who will say with the French minimizer of Christianity's heroic children that flight was but a romantic escapade, a license, cloaked in religion, to enter upon a Bohemian and gypsylike mode of life?

If the lot of the enforced pilgrim for Christ was hard, yet the Master bids His reviled and persecuted children to rejoice and be glad. And His Spouse did not for so much as a moment forget the wanderer. If the ages have given the Church that most tender title of "Our Holy Mother," it was in the earliest dawn of her mission that the maternal instinct was clearly manifested in her solicitude for her afflicted and abandoned members. In the many excellent histories of charity and fraternal love, such as those of Gautier, Chastel, Ratzinger, Uhlhorn or Lallemand, there are golden pages revealing a love of God which found an outlet at this time in noblest deeds of mercy to unfortunate human kind. Truth to tell, the Middle Ages unfold glorious records of innumerable monastic foundations which became the true inns and hospices of the poor and forsaken. Charitable confraternities and associations also sprang up abundantly in those ages of faith. But the Benign Mother was then the Mistress of the World, the Matriarch of the Nations, whose every wish brought untold and fabulous riches to her feet. Of course, it is worth remembering that in days of earthly prosperity and power charity did not weaken nor wither in the Church. Yet it was marvelous to see the infant "Ecclesia" bestirring herself with the utmost solicitude to provide a refuge or a remedy for every misery at home and abroad among the faithful and the ethnic. This blossoming of a divine benevolence might be termed the blooming of the first crocus of the new spring after the dreary winter of paganism; the solemn anathema of the spirit of love upon the soulless philosophy which dared to exclaim with brazen assurance, "Nihil ergo extra se amat Deus." Indeed, when there was even much to be done in the Church in the way of external organization and solidification her all-embracing charity had already created for itself a systematic method of operation. Well might the early defenders of the faith point with confidence to this hitherto unheard-of spirit of love which flowed forth over men of all classes. This was an argument that none could gainsay; here a doctrine that did not parade itself in the garb of sterile words or florid formulæ of conduct. That early "Christmoque," Julian the Apostate, attempted to reproduce this spirit in his pagan renassance at Rome, thus attesting to humanity at large that Christ was alone worthy of imitation when He assigned as a test of His true discipleship that each should love

his neighbor as the Father in heaven hath loved us from all eternity.

So when the greedy and corrupt commonwealth was pushing the harmless and law-abiding Christians off the narrow road of civic justice and equality into the ditch of oppression, where every mean and avaricious citizen might trample them under foot, might fling them into that pit of despair where every crafty and sycophantic politician could find in the hopelessness of their civic status a pretext for renewed favor with the tyrannical Senate or the temporizing Emperor—at this very time of darkest desolation Christ walked among His children in His benign and blessed representatives, teaching all to embrace one another with the kiss of genuine brotherly love. Every little parish had its “*arca, concha carbona*,”⁸⁹ or, in other words, its sacred coffers, whereinto the alms of the faithful gushed as spontaneously and as refreshingly as torrents of purest water. There seemed to be a spirited emulation among the early Christians, most of whom were at first of the poorer classes, to manifest by their generous giving of alms their lively gratitude for the gift of faith. So liberal, in truth, were these donations that certain despicable wretches grew fat, like leeches, on this warm heart-blood flowing from the charity of the faithful. The needs of distant destitute brethren were supplied from many of these ecumenical banks where Jesus was the ever-present chief and president, the Bishop and his clergy the cashiers and every ardent Christian the willing depositor. Thus it came to pass that confessors of the faith languishing in rocky caverns and desert places were supplied with the necessaries of life. These helpless suffering brethren were the first to whom the many angels of charity carried the gifts of the parish dispensary.⁹⁰ Besides, no stranger around whose brow shone the iridescent aureola of faith and suffering for Christ’s sake—and where was the Christian eye that could not discern that unmistakable halo at a glance?—was allowed to pass the door of the Bishop’s house. Bishop Melito, of Sardis, wrote a beautiful directory and guide, now lost, on the gracious virtue of hospitality.⁹¹ But even without this treatise the stranger and exile would have met with the most tender and loving treatment from the clergy. Holy hands took in the fugitives to their sanctuaries of refuge. Lips that were attuned to divine anthems of praise chanted touching snatches of the psalms and early liturgical canticles of love as this pilgrim conqueror of human hearts and human selfishness entered the Bishop’s

⁸⁹ Thomassin, *Ancienne et Nouvelle Discipline de l’eglise*, 3 pars; I., II.; Ratzinger, *Armenpflege*, 68-73, *Einnahme der Armenpflege*; Lallmand, *Histoire de la Charité*, II., Part I.; Tertullian, *Apologet.* XXXIX.

⁹⁰ Const. Apost., V., 1; Probst, *Disciplin*, 171.

⁹¹ Carl Thomas, *Melito von Sardis. Eine kirchengeschichtliche Studie*, 135-137.

presence to present his letters of guarantee.⁹² The venerable man whose cheeks were furrowed and eyes red and swollen from constant weeping over the cruel taking away by legalized butchers of the sweetest and tenderest lambs of his flock, blessed the refugee who immediately handed to him the mystical emblem of Christ, a fish carven from gold or crystal, the recognized symbol from York to Carthage and Jerusalem of true union with the Mother Church at Rome.⁹³ Often, too, the travel-stained hand presented to the Bishop a small case holding the "alimentum indeficiens"—a necessary and consoling adjunct of the fugitive's meagre outfit.⁹⁴ Then was he taken aside for rest and nourishment, loving brethren bathed his tired feet, which had trodden the wine-press of suffering and the thorny road of exile. In those sacred hospices the clergy, from the Bishop down to the youngest acolyte, as it were, became pupils again, sitting at the feet of him who had passed through the school of adversity and could tell what the "imitatio Christi" really meant. They lodged him for three days; they concealed him from his pursuers; they provided him with necessaries as he turned once more to a world unknown, untried, inimical. They gave him letters of recommendation to the distant clergy—foreshadowers of the Tractoriae of later times⁹⁵—thus insuring a kind reception in every Christian house of the widely separated colonies and provinces. There is no more profitable reading in this age of empty philanthropy and futile endeavor for social reform than the touching narrative of the early Christians receiving and entertaining, with almost reverential awe "cum cantis et hymnis in Domino," the countless exiles of the faith. Nor did they stop short here. The wanderer was a brother in Christ. His sorrows were the common inheritance of all the faithful. So the aged prelate on the following Sunday begged the assembled brethren to pray for the hapless exile, for him who had been driven by pagan cruelty from home and all its blessed and cheering associations. The liturgy still preserves, as in a precious urn, much of the aroma of this genuine brotherly spirit. In the Milan liturgy may still be found a prayer "pro fratribus in carceribus, in vinculis, in metallis, in exsilio constitutis."⁹⁶

Beside the right of first claim to the alms of the parish, the extores as bloodless martyrs received other tokens of the deep

⁹² Tertullian, *De Orat.*, 26; *De Cult. Foemin.*, II., 11; *Hermas, Simil.*, IX., 27; *Mandat*, VIII.

⁹³ Cabrol, *La Prière Antique*, 407.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ The Tractoriae were Pontifical passports, allowing the bearer to demand hospitality and service for himself and horses throughout the Christian world. In relation to these billets some interesting data can be found in Migne, *P. L.* 105, 98-100.

⁹⁶ *Auctuarium Solesmense* (Solesmes, 1900), 37.

respect and predilection of the Church. Justin Martyr⁹⁷ records that the "blind and crippled," though not versed in the wisdom of this world, taught the sublime doctrine of the Cross more easily and more completely than Plato ever promulgated his philosophy. The "Magnanimous Man" of the Nicomacchaen Ethics had in truth revealed His secrets to the little ones of the household of the faith, who rejoiced to preach His glory and His unspeakable condescension among men. Now Probst⁹⁸ suggests that it was probably to those of the faithful who returned from exile or survived persecution that the office of catechetes was intrusted. The martyrs were undoubtedly considered part of that quasi-ecclesiastical corps which included the virgins, confessors, widows and deaconesses. Further, a passage in one of St. Cyprian's letters⁹⁹ would lead us to infer that the extores passed over easily into the ranks of the clergy. The Church, following the hint of the Canons of Hippolytus,¹⁰⁰ showed a leniency in this regard worthy of all praise. In her maternal wisdom she adjudged that these students of divinity, having made their course in the Seminary of the Cross, were well fitted therein to receive the priesthood of the Crucified. Then, too, the martyrs from early times enjoyed great power in the Church with regard to the reconciliation of sinners and apostates. Pope Callixtus extended and elevated this prerogative of the martyrs to its apogee. Just what may have been the nature of their privilege in this respect would be hard to say. Some critics think it was the power of readmitting the fallen into the Church in view of a vicarious satisfaction arising from their sufferings; other historians, who are nearer the truth, it seems, maintain that by recommendation of word or letter (*libellus*) from the martyr the sinner and renegade were committed to the indulgence of the Bishop.¹⁰¹ But whatever may have been the extent of this prerogative, it is evident that the Church recognized the dignity of the living martyrs. Hence, too, the holy man of Carthage was moved to write that to be at peace with the martyrs was a certain sign of peace with God.¹⁰²

With such proofs of merciful consideration refreshing him in his

⁹⁷ I. Apol. LX.

⁹⁸ *Lehre und Gebet*, 92; *Disciplin*, 124.

⁹⁹ Ut qui sublimiter Christum confessi sunt essent clerum post modum Christi ministeriis ecclesiasticis adornarent. *Ep. XXXIV.*; also, *Ep. XXIV.*; *Ep. XXXIII.*

¹⁰⁰ *Canon VI.*

¹⁰¹ D'Ales, *op. cit.*, 350; Batiffol, *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positivé* I., 88; Monceaux, *op. cit.*, 432, 367; Probst, *Sakraments*, etc., 295; S. Charrier, in *Revue Augustiniene* (May 15, 1907), under the caption, "Tertullien et les Martyrs Penitentiers," attempts to restrict the powers of the martyrs to simply quieting or assuaging such discords as might arise among the faithful. *Cf.g. also ibid.*, July 15, 1907.

¹⁰² *Ep. XXIII.*

exile, the fugitive would have been an ingrate could he have ever forgotten the gentle Mother who had given him birth to Christ. From the Babylon of this world she watched and prayed and multiplied herself in a thousand delicate ways to lighten his burden and console his sorrows. If from no other motive than gratitude, the self-expatriated confessor felt himself bound to contribute to the spread of the Evangelion, to the casting abroad of the good tidings through all the nations of the earth. Though few cared to scrutinize the hidden designs of the Master in sending to His beloved ones so many and cruel trials, yet most were impelled by reason of their sacrifices made for religion to become ardent and efficient apostles of the Christian cause. The losses sustained for the faith did not tend to embitter the refugee. The touching remembrance of the Master's forgiveness on the Cross drew the exile as by "the odor of His ointments" from the putrid pool of pessimism or the lurid, burning pit of vindictiveness. Waldmann in a beautiful history of the love of enemies in Christian contrasted with pagan society, has proved more than sufficiently that the Cainlike principle of revengeful hatred did not obtain among the followers of Jesus. After all, had He not bidden them carry peace to every city? Had He not commanded them to offer the saving message of salvation to yonder village lying over against the sister hamlet which had had no ear for the Divine Founder and no understanding of His blessed spirit? The keen and observant Tertullian saw the possibilities of a successful propaganda in this very meekness and long suffering.¹⁰³ For, as he said, the pagan would inevitably be captivated by this manifestation of Christian virtue so sublimely superior to the stolid Stoicism and natural probity which in pagan gardens thrived side by side with rank polytheism. Before that St. Ignatius of Antioch bade the faithful pray for the unbeliever and show themselves meek under provocation, in order by such means to win the idolator to Christ.¹⁰⁴ And thus when every road to exile was trodden in those primitive times by men of intense faith and ardent charity—the lukewarm remaining at home without a scruple as to apostatizing—it did seem, indeed, and in its own way was true, that the invasion of enforced Christian fugitives would prove a missionary movement capable of speedily conquering the whole pagan world. To the average idolator of Gaul or Africa, the extores was a living, unanswerable proof of the innate sublimity of the despised superstition which somehow commanded the greatest devotedness, whilst to the lukewarm Christian at home and in the fields a haunting rebuke of his own tepidity, worldliness and culpable loss of faith through

¹⁰³ *Apolog.* XLVI.¹⁰⁴ *Epist.* Ephesian.

miserable compromises and base truckling to this world of darkness and its powerful ones.

We have here, then, a force of anonymous apostles who carried abroad, like winged seed, the saving message of the Galilean Redeemer until even the smallest and most hidden outposts of civilization speedily succumbed to the irresistible impact of their burning zeal and persuasive ministry. Men of principle who adhere boldly to their convictions can, as a rule, beat down any obstacle in their path. With the sharp sword of justice these men, like sturdy pioneers, can cut away any forest that blocks their onward progress. These living martyrs, journeying from place to place, did much, humanly speaking, to further the rapid spread of Christianity, and theirs shall ever be adjudged a miracle of sublime evangelization, despite the overstrained and far-fetched combination of human causes to which its explanation is accredited. The new religion, founded as it was on a rock, was instinct with granitelike attributes. It had nothing in it to commend itself to the carnal-minded pagan who groveled in sensualities or lived but for the glittering baubles of this world. The Founder of the hated superstition was an humble artisan—therefore, an object of scorn to the multitude of proud and haughty jewries where the Hebraic weakness for earthly grandeur and indomitable ambition was nurtured to excess. Furthermore, Christ was a Jew—therefore an outcast and a wretch, an object at the best only deserving of Gentile pity. His heralds spoke in a tongue that pitifully betrayed their mean origin and plebeian standing. No wonder that the Greek, who adored the "Word" with Bramanic enthusiasm, saw nothing in the new religion to attract his thoughts or captivate his spirit. The Roman, for whom language was but the vehicle of that adorable principle—law—could not fall down to adore "in spirit and in truth" the Word made Flesh and dwelling amongst men. Hence the stubborn opposition of the academicians who gauged all material success by

Io bello stile che m' ha fatto onore.

Tertullian himself cries out somewhere, "Quid Academiae et Ecclesiae! Quid luci cum tenebris." The poor and lowly, not the rich and proud, were the first to give attentive ear to the homely and simple spoken agents of the Master. Roman slaves, struggling coloni came over in goodly numbers to the Divine Shepherd's fold. It was not the hope of social betterment or worldly aggrandizement which drew the downtrodden to a religion that was everywhere compelled to walk barefoot in lowly and thorny pathways. It was the sweet wine of peace, the soothing oil of heavenly resignation exuding from every sentence of the Gospel that irresistibly allured and ravished the world-sated, the sin-stained and the miserable.

These found sympathetic brethren in the extores, who knew from bitter experience what misery and suffering actually were.

It is difficult to state exactly in what measure Christianity penetrated into every upland and marshland of the empire and beyond it, through the intelligent efforts of the refugees. The documents of Christian antiquity contain many fragmentary and enigmatical references to the founders of churches in various countries. Duchesne and scores of other historians bear witness to the fact that the self-forgetting heroes who made history in those times cared little for its so-called immortality. To be brief, however, we know from Sozomen¹⁰⁵ that one of the western provinces of Persia, Adiabone, was evangelized from Armenia by the refugees. Eichhorn suggests that some confessors of the faith during the persecution of Nero or Domitian sought refuge in the Raetian Alps, where they converted the natives to Christianity. Egypt,¹⁰⁶ which in the second and third century was a safe haven for the exile's oracle, was likewise a seat of apostolic labor on the part of the extores. Nowhere, probably, did the populace manifest greater tolerance. And the Christians, we may be sure, profited by this opportunity to impart the sacred truths for which they were and had been suffering. This, at least, is the opinion of Tillemont.¹⁰⁷ From the extores' conduct in those parts and their methods of propaganda he formulates the canon which must have regulated their preaching and the use they made of pagan tolerance to spread the faith. Scholars are now agreed that Christianity entered the sand dunes of Lybia through the agency of those who fled from persecution.¹⁰⁸ St. Jerome pictures Paul the Hermit as the pioneer preacher of the faith in the Thebaid.¹⁰⁹ In both these desert places many hid themselves during the troublous times of trial and gradually formed an embryonic monasticism whence the saving light and warmth of the faith radiated throughout the entire region. It is most likely that the ecclesiastics captured by the Goths in their raids on Cappadocia and Galatia were fugitives for Christ.¹¹⁰ Indeed, the data on the introduction of the worship of the true God into the cold, barren "coelum teutonicum" are so few and have been so arbitrarily interpreted that we may still hope for some interesting and illuminating hypotheses on this subject.

This, then, is a brief summary of an important page of the *Acta* revealed to the student who is at pains to fill in the necessary historical context. The "Gesta" and "Passiones Martyrum," whose

¹⁰⁵ Hist. Eccl., II., 12.

¹⁰⁶ Euseb., H. E. VIII., 40.

¹⁰⁷ Memoirs pour servir, etc., III.

¹⁰⁸ Kaufmann, Eine altchristliches Pompeii in der libyschen Wüste, 5.

¹⁰⁹ Vita Sancti Pauli.

¹¹⁰ Philostorgius, H. E. II., 15; Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae, III., 256.

origin, contents and authority Dufourcq has criticized so profoundly and severely, tell the same story of the fugitives, to whom the words of Walafrid Strabo regarding the mediæval Irish monks are applicable, when he says of them that "peregrinantur pro Christo." With the learned professor of Bordeaux, with Delehaye and others, some may consider the "Gesta" as hagiographical romances and apocrypha, or, with De Rossi, Le Blant and Leclercq, may take them as interpolated versions of the original acts introduced by a partisan clergy anxious to frustrate the active literary propaganda of Manichaeism. At all events, they bear witness to the fact that in the fifth and sixth centuries, and after that period, the faithful were never scandalized at beholding their heroic brethren resort to flight. Evident and reckless as are the extravagant statements of one kind or another in the "Gesta," many of the Christians are therein set down as refugees from persecution. Until some coming scholar accurately catalogues and tabulates for us this vast literature of the ages of faith, as Geraets¹¹¹ has done for the Acts of the Merovingian Martyrs, we must be content to undertake the stupendous task of perusing the entire corpus in order to get a comprehensive idea of the number of the extores. Till that day we may satisfy ourselves with the conviction that the doctrine of the Fathers regarding flight from occasions of apostasy was never left in abeyance. From Thomas Aquinas¹¹² to Benedict XIV.¹¹³ is a long cry. But never was a rash self-surrender advised to neophyte or confessor, nor was the timid Christian absolutely and incontinently commanded to brave the tribunal of the pagan Judge. We may add, in conclusion, that the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" in this our own day, and the many published lives of missionaries who have been hated and hunted down by the heathen in more modern times, approve that "law of martyrdom" which St. Gregory Nazianzen declared to consist in "not freely and of our own choice engaging in battle for the faith, since that were the act of a hasty and reckless mind."¹¹⁴

THOMAS M. SCHWERTNER, O. P.

Washington, D. C.

¹¹¹ *Annualaire de l'Universite Catholique de Louvain*, 1899, 360-420.

¹¹² 2.2 ae. *Quaest.*, III., art. 11, ad 2n, 8m.

¹¹³ *De Serv. Beat.*, III., **xvi**, 9.

¹¹⁴ *Orat.* 10.

THE CHURCH AND ASTRONOMY BEFORE AND AFTER GALILEO.

CATHOLICS who know the realities of the Galileo case have grown tired of explaining that the famous trial of the great Italian astronomer is an historical incident almost entirely personal in character, an exception to the general rule of the relationship of the Popes to science and absolutely no index of the policy of the Popes or of the Church toward things scientific, and, above all, toward astronomy. In spite of this view, so well established by the most careful and complete research, the Galileo affair is constantly assumed by Protestant writers and, of course, by the Protestant public generally, to be the keynote of the Papal attitude to science—the one fact from which all history may be judged. Cardinal Newman once said that the Galileo case was the exception that proved the rule of beneficent patronage of science uniformly exhibited by the Church authorities. It is “the one stock argument to the contrary.” Professor Augustus de Morgan, in his article on “The Motion of the Earth” in the English Encyclopedia, an authority not likely to be suspected of Catholic sympathies, has expressed exactly this same conclusion.

“The Papal power,” he says, “must upon the whole have been moderately used in matters of philosophy, if we may judge by the great stress laid on this one case of Galileo. It is the standing proof that an authority which has lasted a thousand years was all the time occupied in checking the progress of thought! There are certainly one or two other instances, but those who make most of the outcry do not know them.” Professor Huxley, writing to St. George Mivart, November 12, 1885, says “that after looking into the Galileo case while he was on the ground in Italy he had arrived at the conclusion that “the Pope and the College of Cardinals had rather the best of it.” In our own time M. Bertrand, the perpetual secretary of the French Academy of Sciences, declared that “the great lesson for those who would wish to oppose reason with violence was clearly to be read in Galileo’s story, and the scandal of his condemnation was brought about without any profound sorrow to Galileo himself; and his long life, considered as a whole, must be looked upon as the most serene and enviable in the history of science.”¹ Any one who knows the circumstances refuses any longer to accept the significance so usually given the Galileo case by writers who must find material in opposition to the Church.

¹ See Appendix, “Popes and Science,” Walsh, Fordham University Press, 1908.

I have thought, however, that since the Galileo case has been taken in many minds to show that the Church was opposed to the development of science, and especially to the progress of astronomy, that a presentation of another phase of the history of astronomical science during the century preceding and following the Galileo incident might be of service as showing the true attitude of the Church toward astronomy and astronomers. In every department of science that I have had to investigate, where there has been question on the part of Protestant historians of opposition by the Church authorities to the development of a particular science, I have always found that the reason for the confident assertion they make as to Church opposition to science is that they are ignorant of the real history of the science in question.

A typical example is to be found in the views held by many writers with regard to surgery. Surgery is supposed to be a recent development in the history of science, because during the Middle Ages the Church set itself in direct opposition to the development of anatomy in such a way as to prevent that evolution of surgery which must depend on accurate anatomical knowledge. President Andrew D. White, formerly professor of history at Cornell, summing up what many others have said before him, declares in his "History of Warfare of Science With Theology in Christendom" that as a consequence of this attitude of the Church towards surgery, surgery did not develop at all during the Middle Ages. He even goes farther and declares that "so deeply was the idea (of the sacredness of the human body) rooted in the mind of the Universal Church that for over a thousand years surgery was considered dishonorable; the greatest monarchs were often unable to secure an ordinary surgical operation, and it was only in 1406 that a better beginning was made, when the Emperor Wenzel of Germany ordered that dishonor should no longer attach to the surgical profession."

This paragraph, as I have shown in my chapter on "The Church and Surgery" in the volume "The Popes and Science,"² probably contains more arrant nonsense with regard to surgery and its history than one might think could possibly be compressed into so short a space. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, far from being periods barren of surgical development, constitute the most fruitful epoch in the history of surgery down to our own time. Gurlt, the great German historian of surgery, has devoted some three hundred pages of the first volume of his authoritative "History of Surgery in Middle and Western Europe," to the period when President White so calmly tells us there was no surgery in Europe. Professor Pagel, another German authority on the history of medicine, has devoted

² "The Popes and Science," Fordham University Press, New York, 1908.

much attention to this time, and tells us that "a more favorable star shone over surgery than over medicine during the Middle Ages." All the authorities are agreed in declaring this time to be much more important in the history of surgery than many of the succeeding centuries. President White knows nothing of the history of surgery at this time, and assumes that there was none.

Just this same state of affairs exists with regard to other sciences, as I have already said. A typical example is to be found in the history of astronomy. Those who exaggerate the significance of the Galileo case declare that the reason why astronomy did not develop before this time was that the Church was so unalterably opposed to it that its development was seriously hampered, if not actually prevented. They say this so confidently that ordinary readers are sure that they must know that there was no development of astronomy before Galileo's time. As a matter of fact, there is a very rich history of astronomy for several centuries before Galileo. There is no doubt that he was a great genius who illuminated his favorite science; there is no doubt either that his example inspired many other investigators to do great work, and that his discoveries ushered in a new and wonderful period in astronomical science; but to say that there was no astronomy before Galileo or that the subject had not been pursued seriously and very fruitfully by many profound students is quite as egregious a mistake as to say that surgery did not develop down to the beginning of the fifteenth century.

As a matter of fact, astronomy had developed very wonderfully before Galileo's time, and some of the men whose names are greatest in that science had made their contributions to it during centuries long before the seventeenth. Among them deserves to be mentioned Albertus Magnus, whose contributions to physical geography and to the general state of information with regard to the rotundity of the earth and the existence of the antipodes must be considered as representing the foundation of modern astronomy. His great contemporary, Roger Bacon, worked out the theory of lenses and suggested that light moved at a definite velocity, thus adding his quota to the foundation of astronomy. It was in the fifteenth century, however, that the beginnings of astronomy in our modern sense came, and the father of modern observation in astronomy is Regiomontanus. After him the great name in the science of the stars is, of course, Copernicus, and with him the newest phase in the development of astronomical science begins. The interesting feature about the work of all these men is that it was accomplished during the leisure afforded them by their occupations as clergymen. All of these men were faithful sons of the Church and were proud and happy to recognize her as their mother. Albertus Magnus has

received the honors of beatification. Regiomontanus, having been brought down to Rome by the Popes in order to correct the calendar, so impressed himself upon the ecclesiastical authorities in the Papal capital that he was made the Bishop of Ratisbon, succeeding after two centuries that other great ecclesiastical scientist, Albertus Magnus, in this see. Copernicus was the canon of the Cathedral at Frauenberg, a personal friend of his Bishop, who devoted himself to the help of his Bishop in keeping that diocese in the Catholic fold during the stormy times of Luther's revolt in Germany, when the dioceses all round them were going over to Lutheranism.

All this shows that surely there was no opposition between the Church and astronomy, but, on the contrary, that men were held in high estimation for their astronomical knowledge and received preferment in the Church as a consequence of it. One great churchman, Cardinal Nicholas, of Cusa, who was very close to the councils of the Papacy during the fifteenth century and who was commissioned to make such reforms as were needed in Germany, was also distinguished for his advanced thinking with regard to astronomical questions, and, as pointed out by Janssen in the first volume of his "History of the German People," declared that "the earth moves like the other stars," and other teachings that are supposed to be distant from such men's thoughts at that time.

The Galileo case is not the culmination of organized effort by ecclesiastical authority against astronomy. Of any such policy there is not a trace to be found anywhere. There is, moreover, another way of looking at the significance of the Galileo case on the background of what was being done for astronomy by churchmen just before and after his time that constitutes an even more striking contradiction of the impressions that many people derive from this famous historical trial and try to impress upon others. This is the relation of the priests of the Society of Jesus, the great teaching order established just about a century before Galileo's trial in 1534, and into whose hands were gradually falling the best opportunities for education in Europe about the time that Galileo became prominent. The Jesuits were closely attached to the Pope. The idea of their founder was that they should be a special Papal soldiery ready always to go wherever the Pope sent them, taking a special vow to this effect and trained to think of themselves as representing the Pope's special servants. During the century before and after the Galileo trial they were looked upon by all of Europe as in closer communion with the thoughts of the Papacy and as representing Papal thought and influence more than any other set of men.

It so happened that very early in the history of this order its members became interested in astronomy. Their teaching of the

studious youth of Europe tempted them to be leaders in thought in this great scientific department as well as in classical education. It was the one phase in physical science that was developing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with that strict scientific method and thoroughgoing investigation and observation that characterizes modern science. The Jesuits devoted themselves to it not only with enthusiasm, but with a success that has written their names large over all the history of astronomy for three centuries. Every single advance in astronomy saw the work of some Jesuit contributing to the conclusions that were finally reached. In many departments the original initiative came from them, and the intimate communication between their various houses brought about a wide diffusion of the enthusiasm for study that was of the greatest possible benefit for the rising science. Nearly every important Jesuit college had an observatory, in which good work was being done, and all the great secular investigators in science were glad to be in touch with the Jesuits, to write and receive letters from them, and in general to acknowledge that this body of clergymen was a world-wide academy of astronomers with whose work it was necessary to be in touch if one would keep himself *au courant* with astronomical progress.

Modern historians of astronomy and writers on the development of the science have not been slow to admit how much was done for their scientific department by the Jesuits. It is scarcely in Germany, however, that one could look for significant tributes to the successful devotion of the Jesuits to science, yet in recent years science has come to obliterate international prejudice and to smooth international feelings, and so it is not so surprising as it might otherwise be that it should also obliterate religious bigotry and intolerance. Bearing this in mind, a recent expression of Professor Foster, the director of the astronomical observatory at Berlin, in which he gives due credit to the Jesuit astronomers, past and present, will not be so surprising as it might otherwise be. In the *Quarterly Journal* of the German Astronomical Society for 1890 Professor Foster said:³ "Among the members of the Society of Jesus in the past and in the present we find so many excellent astronomers, and in general so many investigators of purest scientific devotion that it is of important interest to their colleagues in science to notice them."

This tribute from Protestant Germany, in which for twenty years before its utterance the Jesuits had not been allowed to teach, and from which they had been driven so ruthlessly by a German Gov-

³ "Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomische Gesellschaft," 1890, page 60. "Among the members of the Society of Jesus in the past and in the present we find so many excellent astronomers and in general so many investigators of purest scientific devotion that it is of important interest to their colleagues in science to notice them."

ernment that called the movement it was engaged in when it banished them a Kulturkampf—as if it were a struggle for culture and education—is the best possible evidence of how Jesuit scientists have won even their enemies to admiration of their accomplishments. The compliment may serve, indeed, as an introduction to what the Jesuits did for astronomy, though it must not be taken to mean that the members of the order did not devote themselves to other forms of science. Their names occur in every branch of science. They began their existence only in the middle of the sixteenth century, for more than a half century after 1773 they were not in existence, and yet the number of distinguished scientists in the order is simply marvelous. Poggendorf's "Biographical Dictionary of the Exact Sciences" contains in its first two volumes the names of 8,847 savants from remote antiquity until 1863. Amongst these names a little more than ten per cent. are those of Catholic clergymen. This number is magnificently significant of the attitude of the Church to science if we only reflect that clergymen take up science as a favorite avocation, while for most scientific discoverers the pursuit of science was in some form their vocation in life. Most of them belonged to professions which obliged them to devote themselves to the exact sciences, and they were teachers of physics and mathematics, chemists, hydrographers, engineers, nautical authorities and the like. Clergymen took up science, however, as a pleasure, not a labor.

Science, then, has been a favorite avocation for a great many clergymen, and they have pursued it with marked success. Amongst nearly 1,000 Catholic clergymen who have been distinguished in the domain of the exact sciences the Jesuits number nearly fifty per cent. Among the great number of men of all kinds who have proved themselves successful in the pursuit of science the Jesuits during the short space of two and a half centuries of existence have succeeded in placing about one out of twenty of all the men who were to be remembered by succeeding generations for attainments in science. For a society that was founded to carry out the will of the Papacy as exactly as possible, that has always devoted itself to the fulfillment of this object with exemplary fidelity, to have given this large number of men to science is the best possible answer to any pretense that the Popes or the Church were opposed in any way to scientific development.

Almost from the very beginning of their history, as I have said, the Jesuits applied themselves with the liveliest interest and with corresponding success to the study of astronomical problems. Within twenty-five years of the foundation of the order some distinguished astronomical observers had developed among them. At

the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the order was as yet scarcely more than half a century old, they were in correspondence with the great astronomers of the time—Kepller and Galileo—and were looked upon as distinguished authorities of the time. Already many of them had made original contributions of high order to various departments of astronomy, and it came to be a tradition that some of their best men should be constantly assigned to the task of keeping up Jesuit prestige in astronomical researches. De Backer's "Library of Writers of the Society of Jesus"⁴ shows that over 200 writers among the Jesuits have made important contributions to astronomical literature.⁵

The first Jesuit to attract world-wide attention for his attainments in astronomy, and especially the mathematics relating to it, was the famous Father Clavius, to whom Pope Gregory XIII. entrusted the reformation of the calendar. The Gregorian calendar, which was then substituted for the Julian calendar, so thoroughly corrects the tendency of the formal year to depart from the solar year that there will be a difference of a day in the reckoning only once in some three thousand five hundred years. By making every fourth thousand year, then, an exception to the ordinary rule with regard to intercalary days, even this tendency may be so overcome that further correction will not be needed for a term of nearly one hundred thousand years. Under ordinary circumstances, then, this will amply suffice to keep the computation of human time in sufficiently close relationship to that of celestial time, and the ease with which the difficult problem was solved only serves to show how well it had been studied out and how ingeniously the great Jesuit mathematician had succeeded in reaching an expression in very simple terms for correction purposes.

Besides the correction of the calendar, though it is not generally known, we owe also to Father Clavius the invention of that important instrument, the vernier, without which it would be so difficult to make many of the exact observations of all kinds in laboratories. This little instrument consists incidentally of two measuring scales

⁴ De Backer's "Bibliotheque des Ecrivains de la Comp. de Jesus," Paris, 1876.

⁵ The material for this article has been largely derived from the papers on Jesuit astronomy written for *Popular Astronomy* by Father William F. Rigge, S. J., of Creighton University Observatory, Omaha, Nebraska. The first of these papers, on the "Jesuit Astronomy of the Old Society," is a translation by Father Rigge of Father Johann Schreiber's article on the Jesuits of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and their relation to astronomy, published in the German periodical, *Natur und Offenbarung* ("Nature and Revelation"), Vol. XLIX., 1903. Father Johann Schreiber, S. J., was for years the assistant astronomer at the Haynald Observatory of the Jesuits at Kalocsa, Hungary. His death, March 10, 1903, deprived the scientific world of a distinguished worker.

moving upon one another and so arranged that one of them is divided into ten divisions, to which correspond nine divisions of the other, so that measurements can be read to tenths of the unit employed, whether that be an inch or a centimeter or a degree of an angle. Until comparatively recent years the invention of this extremely useful appliance has been attributed to either Nonius or Vernier. Brencing, however, in an article on "Nonius or Vernier" in the "Astronomische Nachrichten,"⁶ says: "Clavius has been forgotten or neglected in an unintelligible way. I was surprised when I came upon the following passages in his works, which give the clearest proof that we are indebted to no other than Clavius for the theory of vernier sub-division as well for linear as for circular measurement. They have been overlooked." He then quotes in full the passages which prove his assertion.

After Father Clavius the most distinguished Jesuit worker in astronomy was Father Christopher Scheiner, who died about 1650. He was one of the first, if not actually the first, to discover sun spots in March, 1611, and from that time on he observed them uninterruptedly, organizing a corps of observers, all Jesuits, to observe simultaneously in many other places. How wide this chain of observers was as the result of the spread of the order will be appreciated from the list, which shows Father Cysatus working at Ingolstadt, Father Gall in Lisbon, Portugal, Father Schönberger in Freiburg, Father Ruess in the West Indies, Father Malapertius in Belgium and Father Biancani in Parma. Father Scheiner's observations were made mainly upon the sun. He was the first to apply the so-called dark glasses that are now generally used and the first to invent the artifice of placing a diaphram over the objective. He succeeded in collecting a truly wonderful amount of information regarding the sun, considering the inadequate means at his command. It has even been declared by good authorities that except for spectroscopy and photography, solar researches have not yielded anything in recent years that cannot be found in Scheiner's observations.

All that he had discovered with regard to the sun was published in a great work under the title "Rosa Ursina" in 1631. The German astronomer Winecke declared thirty years ago in the German *Quarterly of the Astronomical Society*⁷ that "in his 'Rosa Ursina' Scheiner established truths that have been forgotten because this early observer was wantonly set aside, and then these once discovered truths had to be found out anew in our time." It is with regard to sun spots particularly that Scheiner's work shows his wonderful

⁶ Vol. XCVI., page 131.

⁷ "Vierteljahrsschrift der Astr. Ges." 1878.

powers of observation. He had mastered very thoroughly the formation and dissolution of the spots. The word *faculæ* comes from him. He had formed ideas about physical constitution of the sun very like those of to-day, and he even surmised that the interior of the sun, the nucleus or kernel, might have a rotational velocity different from that of the outer shell.

It is not surprising that Father Scheiner's greatest pupil, Father Cysatus, should have made some magnificent observations. He was the first to use a telescope on a comet. This was the comet of 1618. Wolff, in the "History of Astronomy," says that "his (Cysatus') paper on this comet, published in the 'Mathemata Astronomica' of Ingolstadt in 1619, is justly numbered among the most important papers of former times concerning comets." One very wonderful thing in the paper is that Cysatus shows that he had found a curvature in the orbit of the planet which had been supposed to be a straight line, and he declares that this would be a phenomenon of great importance if it could be confirmed by further observation. He would not trust himself, however, to come to a conclusion in the matter, so little was the deviation from a straight line, which yet did not escape his acute powers of observation. His description of comets remains classical down to our own day. After comets he turned his attention to nebulæ. They seemed to him to furnish an explanation of the structure of the comet's head. Cysatus was the first to mention not only the nebula of Orion, but also the so-called trapezium, that is, the stars that are compressed into a very narrow space in this nebula. This discovery is generally ascribed to Huygens, but there is no doubt that Cysatus had seen this phenomenon and described it many years before the Dutch astronomer.

Early in the seventeenth century the Jesuits began to make interesting and important observations on the stars. Father Zupi was the first to describe the dark stripes or bands which are to be found on Jupiter. He was also the first to see the phases of Mercury which Galileo surmised more than saw, and he furnished accurate drawings of this manifestation. Father Grimaldi carefully studied Saturn and determined very closely its oblateness.

The name of a great Jesuit astronomer is connected quite as closely with our knowledge of the moon as are the names of brother Jesuits with the sun. Father Riccioli introduced the lunar nomenclature, which is in use even to-day and which has lessened the labor of the memory in locating the lunar formations. His colleague, Father Grimaldi, drew up one of the first maps of the moon worthy of the name. This was published in the year 1651 in Father Riccioli's "Almagest." Wolff, in his "Handbuch of Astronomy," says

that the merits of this map have been much underestimated. It is in some particulars superior in completeness and accuracy even to Hevelius' map. Riccioli described the surface of the moon, and Wolff says that his remarks as to the probable nature of the surface are juster than those of most of his immediate successors. Both himself and Father Grimaldi occupied themselves with observations of the libration of the moon. Their published observations in this matter would make a good sized book. They were closely in touch with Hevelius at this time, and the epistolary correspondence of these three astronomers contains some interesting passages.

The most important literary work of the Jesuits during the seventeenth century was the "Almagestum Novum," written by Father J. B. Riccioli and published at Bologna in 1653. Ptolemy's great work on astronomy, which was the text-book of Europe for fifteen hundred years, is usually called, because of its Arabian designation, the "Almagest." Father Riccioli took a very ambitious name then. Von Littrow made little of the value of the work. Distinguished authorities, however, have agreed in designating the "Almagestum Novum" as the pandect of astronomical knowledge. This is a colossal work, and yet its author's modest object, as stated in the preface, was mainly to provide ready information for brother Jesuit astronomers. His idea was to make "an astronomical work which may be a kind of library for the men of our society and for others who cannot have access to the great number of such books or the leisure to read them—a work in which I have collected with the greatest fullness the whole of the old and the new astronomy, together with the controversies that occurred therein. This work is all the more valuable because it contains, perhaps, for the first time in the history of book-making, an index, in which all the persons mentioned in the book are named and the data of their lives, together with the pages on which references to their work occurs."⁸

Among the most noteworthy incidents in the story of the Jesuits' relations to astronomy is probably to be found in their relations to

⁸ Von Littrow's unjustified criticism of Father Riccioli's work is a reminder that occasionally one finds such prejudice existing among astronomical historians, and that the work of the Jesuits, because of intolerance, is not given its due place. It scarcely seems possible that the history of science would be thus disfigured, but it is. Professor Simon Newcomb, one of our best authorities on mathematical astronomy in this country, has vindicated Father Maximilian Hell, the Jesuit, against the misrepresentations of Von Littrow in the astronomical papers of "The American Ephemeris," Vol. II., pages 301-302. He says: "The conclusion was reached that Littrow's inferences were entirely at fault. Littrow's mistakes were due to the fact that he was color blind to red, in consequence of which he wholly misjudged the case on first examining the manuscript, and afterward saw everything from the point of view of a prosecuting attorney."

Kepler, the astronomer to whom we owe the laws that form the basis of modern astronomy. Kepler was, indeed, upon the very best terms with the Jesuits and continued to be so all his life. The great mathematical astronomer had been expelled by the Lutherans from the University of Tübingen and excommunicated by one of the Lutheran pastors at Linz. When the Emperor of Austria, however, issued a decree banishing all Protestant professors from the Austrian universities, Kepler was exempted by name and continued to occupy the chair of astronomy at the University of Gratz, and it was well understood that it was mainly through the influence of the Jesuits that this exception in his favor was made. There are a number of letters extant which passed between Kepler and the Jesuits, and especially a communication with regard to astrology, in which Kepler expressed his belief in this illusion, addressed to Fathers Serrarius and Ziegler, in Mainz. The date of this was October 18, 1606, twenty-five years before the condemnation of Galileo.

It is very evident that during the half century in which Galileo's work was done—from 1600 to 1650—the Jesuits were not only not hampered at all by their ecclesiastical superiors in the study of astronomy, but must have been encouraged in every way. We find them at work not in one or two places, but in every part of the world where there was an opportunity. We find them engaged not on a few academic problems, but on every phase of scientific progress. The sun, the moon, the stars, the comets, all the heavenly bodies come in for their attention, and with regard to every one of these subjects work done by Jesuits constitutes an important chapter in the history of astronomy. Very probably if their work had not been done others would have been found to do it, but as a matter of fact no other body of men connected by any bond in history accomplished so much for astronomy at this time as they did. They were in epistolary correspondence with most of the distinguished astronomical observers of the time and were looked upon by these men as respected colleagues and worthy workers in the same great cause.

The policy of the first half of the seventeenth century was to be continued during the next 125 years, until the suppression of the Jesuits. Humboldt, in his "Kosmos," at the beginning of the nineteenth century, writes: "I drew attention to the fact that Alpha of the Southern Cross is one of those stars whose multiple nature was first recognized in 1681 and 1687 by the Jesuits Fontaney, Noel and Richaud. This early recognition of binary systems," he adds, "is the more remarkable as Lacaille seventy years later did not describe Alpha Crucis as a double star. Richaud also discovered

the binary character of Alpha Centauri almost simultaneously with that of Alpha Crucis and fully nineteen years before the voyage of Feuillée, to whom Henderson erroneously attributed the discovery." This beginning of work on the double stars was to be continued with marvelous success by their Jesuit colleagues during the next century. It was Father Christian Mayer, S. J., working at Mannheim, who made the double stars a subject of special research. He expressly stated that "the smaller stars, which are so near the larger, are either illuminated naturally dark planets, or that both of these cosmic bodies, the principal star and its companion (the word *comes* which he used for this has since become classic) are self-luminous suns revolving around each other. That any fraternal solidarity did not influence their astronomical opinions can be appreciated from the fact that some of Father Mayer's teaching with regard to the double stars was rather strenuously assailed by Father Maximilian Hell, S. J., himself a distinguished astronomer and director of the Imperial Observatory of Vienna.

During the eighteenth century the work done by the Jesuit astronomers at the Imperial Observatory of Vienna attracted widespread attention. Father Maximilian Hell, whom we have already mentioned, issued about thirty separate publications. He edited the astronomical Ephemerides, in which the progress in astronomy was noted for nearly thirty years, and was succeeded in this editorial office by Father Triesnecker. The observations of the Jesuit astronomers at Vienna on the transit of Venus of 1761 are among the most valuable recorded. They were in correspondence at this time with Jesuits in many parts of the world.

One of the most distinguished contributors to astronomical science among the Jesuits during the eighteenth century was Father Roger Boscovich. We owe to him seventy rather important publications. Most of these are on astronomical subjects. One on gravitation attracted wide attention. Another on the determination of the orbits of comets and another on the annual abberations of fixed stars are mentioned especially by Houzeau in his "Vademecum de L'Astronomia," which is usually considered one of the best bibliographical guides in astronomical literature. Father Boscovich did his work at Rome, and his opinions were frequently quoted everywhere as of authority. His work, and especially his suggestions with regard to the measurements of terrestrial arcs and his opinion as to the most probable value of the ellipticity of the earth from the results of all the measurements accessible to him, represented for geodesy, according to Wolff in his "Handbook of Astronomy," "the dawn of a new day."

Probably for our modern time the most interesting popular phase

of the success of the Jesuits in their devotion to astronomy is the number of ingenious instruments which they invented. Usually it would not be expected that such serious students devoted to book learning would have much success as mechanical inventors. While we might not be surprised at their accomplishment as observers, as mathematical calculators and as authors in astronomical matters, the invention of instruments would surely seem to be out of their line. We have already seen, however, that one of the most important adjustments for scientific instruments, the vernier, is the invention of Father Clavius, though called, as is the case with many another invention, by some one else's name. It is to them also that we owe the equatorial mounting of telescopes, by which the telescope, being turned about an axis parallel to the earth, enables one always to keep a star in the field of view without difficulty once the tube has been set upon it. This invention is derived from a contrivance of the Tyrolese Father Christopher Grienberger, who died in Rome in 1636. Father Scheiner is the inventor of the first astronomical telescope—that is, one consisting of convex glasses exclusively, the telescope in use before this, the so-called Dutch telescope, having both concave and convex glasses and absorbing much more light. This telescope has so many advantages that it entirely superseded the older form. Father Scheiner is also the inventor of the pantograph for the reproduction of drawings to scale which is so generally used to-day.

The idea of the reflecting telescope also comes from a Jesuit, and, curiously enough, was suggested by a young man scarcely more than twenty years of age, Father Nicholas Zucchi, who carried out the idea so far that he took the image made by a concave mirror and examined it with a concave lense. The idea of using the circular field formed by the last diaphragm in the telescope as a micrometer, called a ring micrometer, was the happy invention of Father Bosco-vich toward the end of the eighteenth century. Father Kircher, the distinguished Jesuit scientist and collector, after whom the Kircherian Museum at Rome is named, was the inventor of an apparatus for demonstrating to students the relative positions of the planets and the sun. He is also the inventor of what we now know as the magic lantern, the idea for which came from another Jesuit, but was developed by Father Kircher for teaching purposes.

Since the refoundation of the Jesuits at the beginning of the nineteenth century the same devotion to astronomy has characterized the order as before the suppression. One might think that in the supreme devotion of the generations of the nineteenth century to science and the success that has resulted the work of the Jesuits would be entirely overshadowed. This has not proved to be the case, however, but, on the contrary, in many parts of the world they

have accomplished so much by original investigation of a high order in subjects of all kinds relating to the heavens as to attract wide-spread attention. One of the great astronomers of the century was among their number. The work done at their observatories at Rome, at Stonyhurst, England; at Georgetown, in the United States, and at Kalocsa, in Hungary, has held the eyes of the astronomical world. In Havana and in Manila their observations in meteorology have added new chapters to this science and have proved the basis for practical advances in the foretelling of tropical storms that have saved thousands of lives and an immense amount of property. Their work has been thoroughly appreciated by the United States Government, at whose expense the observations made by the Jesuits in Manila have been published for the benefit of the world, since the Jesuits were without the means of publishing them.

The greatest exemplar of what the Jesuits did in astronomy came in the nineteenth century—indeed, so close to our own time that the memory of his work and accomplishment does not need to be recalled to many of our scientists, and especially astronomers, who followed it in the course of its accomplishment. Father Angelo Secchi, the head of the Roman observatory, was probably the greatest astronomer of the second half of the nineteenth century. He is the father of astronomical spectroscopy and one of the most ingenious of men, of almost unexampled devotion to his astronomical observations and marvelous success in the applications of his work to science and to teaching. All our modern text-books of astronomy not only mention his name with reverence, but still use his theories and his illustrations for teaching purposes. To quote from an unpublished manuscript sketch of Father Secchi's life by Father Rigge, S. J.:⁹ "Simon Newcomb, who is acknowledged by all to be at present the world's greatest mathematical astronomer, devotes considerable space in his text-book of 'Popular Science' to what he calls Secchi's first theory and Secchi's later theory of sun spots. Langley, in his 'New Astronomy,' gives a number of Secchi's illustrations. Secchi's typical sun spot as well as other figures still appear in every popular no less than in every technical treatise on the sun."

It was with regard to the sun that Father Secchi's greatest work was done. His text-book, "Le Soleil," written in French and printed in Paris in 1870, is the fundamental treatise for our knowledge of the sun during the nineteenth century. Every book written on the sun since quotes it, and its illustrations are largely drawn upon even

⁹ This sketch is to be published later in a series of "Makers of Astronomy," which, like "The Makers of Medicine and of Electricity," will serve to bring out very clearly that the great minds of science, far from being unbelieving, were profound and even devout believers.

at the present time. It was translated into most modern languages and became the standard work on the subject. Besides his work on sun spots, in which Father Secchi was a modern pioneer, his observations on the corona of the sun during eclipses, and especially his photographs of this object, place him among the great original contributors to our astronomical knowledge. In his own time his observations were considered the best of their kind that had ever been made, and far ahead of anything that had been accomplished before.

The critical examination and classification of the spectra of 4,000 stars entails an enormous amount of work. One would think that the observation for this would occupy a lifetime. Father Secchi was thoroughly convinced, however, that it was no use making observations unless they were thoroughly recorded and made available for others. His literary work in astronomy, then, is almost incredible. He sent nearly 700 communications to forty-two journals. Over 300 of these appeared in the *Comptes Rendues* and in the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, the French and German journals of astronomy that are the authoritative records of scientific work. Besides this he wrote five books, the one on the sun we have already mentioned, a second on the stars was published in Milan in 1877, a third was on "Cosmography," a fourth was on "The Unity of the Physical Forces" and a fifth a posthumous work on "The Elements of Terrestrial Physics." The titles of his productions, without comment and without repetition, cover the amazing number of nineteen pages quarto in double columns of Summervogel's "Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus."¹⁰

While his name is irrevocably attached to the development of the astronomy of the sun, Father Secchi made observations of great value on every form of heavenly body and almost on every object that can be seen in the skies. He made frequent measurements of the heights of the mountains of the moon and called attention to many special features of its surface. He examined all the planets diligently, and was one of the first to see the so-called canals on Mars and to observe Jupiter's third satellite as spotted. "He made many spectroscopic observations on the comets and examined carefully the spectra of nebulae, meteors and auroras. It was with regard to the fixed stars more than to any other class of heavenly bodies, possibly more even than to the sun itself, that Father Secchi has won for himself an undying name. Besides measuring innumerable positions of double stars (Gledhill's "Double Stars" mentions his observations on almost every page), he was the founder of a new

¹⁰ This is the catalogue, in nine quarto volumes, of the works written by Jesuits during their existence for about three hundred years.

branch of astronomy, 'Stellar Spectroscopy,' and his analysis was so comprehensive and so thorough that Secchi's types of stellar spectra will ever remain an essential illustration in astronomical text-books." Here we have quoted once more from Father Rigge's article.

With all this it would be thought impossible that Father Secchi should ever have occupied himself with anything else. He was driven out of Rome by the Revolution of 1848, and for some two years worked at Georgetown University, in Washington, D. C. There he occupied himself for a time with a study of electricity, and his first book, "Researches on Electrical Rheometry," was accepted for publication by the Smithsonian Institution in September, 1850, and appeared as Volume III., Article II. of "Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge," Washington, 1852. His observations in electricity naturally led him to magnetism, and he was one of the first to build a magnetic observatory and record and investigate carefully the behavior of the magnetic elements of the earth. Whatever he touched he illuminated. He built a third observatory for meteorology. His ingenuity enabled him to invent a number of instruments for the automatic observation of the weather, and one of these, his meteorograph, was exhibited at the Paris Universal Exhibition of 1867 and won for its inventor the grand prize of 100,000 francs and the cross of the Legion of Honor. This distinction was conferred upon Father Secchi by the Emperor Napoleon III. in person, in presence of the Emperors of Russia and Austria and of the Kings of Prussia and Belgium. The Emperor of Brazil sent him a golden rose as a token of his appreciation.

We think that even this brief enumeration of what Father Secchi accomplished will make it very clear that he was not only one of the greatest astronomers of the modern time, but also one of the acutest scientific minds of the nineteenth century. With all this he was an extremely faithful priest and a devout religious. He was noted for his faithfulness to his religious duties and for his devotion to his order. In his first book, "L'Unita della Forze Fisiche" ("The Unity of Physical Forces"), he demonstrates the wonderful unity that obtains among the great forces of nature and how this unity is an implied proof of the existence and oneness of the Creator. No one had penetrated more deeply into modern physical science, and no one had realized the wonders of astronomy which through the spectroscope have been brought into the realm of men's knowledge in the last half century, yet his science, far from creating any doubts or difficulties for his faith, had strengthened his belief in the Creator, in Providence and in the beneficence of the mysterious powers that we feel all round us.

There have been other scarcely less distinguished contributors to astronomy than Father Secchi among the Jesuits of the nineteenth century. One of the best known of these was Father De Vico, whose determination of the rotation period of Venus and the inclination of its axis was considered so exhaustive that it was not questioned for half a century. Father De Vico also measured the eccentric position of Saturn in his rings and observed the motions of the two inner moons of this planet, which had not been seen before this time except by Herschel. He also discovered eight comets, one of them being the well-known comet with a period of five and a half years, which bears his name. Unfortunately this devoted observer, who had already given such magnificent evidence of his power to help in the development of astronomy, was driven from Rome during the Revolution of 1848 and went first to France, where he was enthusiastically welcomed by Arago, and then to England, whence he came to Georgetown College, but after a few months died, at the early age of forty-three.

Father Perry, of Stonyhurst College, England, was another of the distinguished Jesuit astronomers of the nineteenth century whose observations made him known to all the astronomical world. On a number of occasions he was asked to head government astronomical expeditions for special work. He was in command of the expedition to Kerguelen Land in 1874 to observe the transit of Venus in the South Indian Ocean. At the next transit of Venus, in 1882, Father Perry was asked to head another expedition which made its observations in Madagascar. At least four times he went at the head of expeditions to observe total eclipses of the sun. In 1889 he headed the expedition for this purpose that had its headquarters near Devil's Island, in the West Indies, since made famous by the Dreyfus case, and here he died of a pestilential fever after having accomplished some of the best work done anywhere during this eclipse. Father Perry was noted for his observations on Jupiter's satellites and for having done excellent work in meteorology and magnetic surveying, as well as establishing routine work of great value at Stonyhurst. His observations on sun spots conducted there was particularly valuable.

Father Sidgreaves, who succeeded Father Perry as the director of the Stonyhurst College observatory, is doing photographic work in astronomy that has attracted widespread attention. His photographs of the spectra of new stars and of the changing spectra of certain stars were exhibited at the Royal Society of England and the Paris Exposition and attracted much attention. Father Hagan, of the Georgetown University, is known for his work on variable stars and his "Atlas of Variable Stars" has laid a definite foundation

of knowledge in this important subject which enables astronomers to carry their observations further with absolute assurance of progress. Father Algue, of Manila, is known for his work in meteorology rather than astronomy proper, but he is looked upon as the world authority on the sudden storms of the Philippines, and it was he who, at the invitation of the United States Government, issued the large work in two volumes on "The Filipino Archipelago" published some eight years ago by the Government Printing Office.¹¹

The New Society, as the refounded order is sometimes called, has been quite as ingenious in its inventions of instruments as the old society. One of the problems that has bothered astronomers has been the question of the exact moment of star transits and the difficulty that even the estimate of the same observer is subject to considerable variations. Father Braun, of the Hungarian observatory, and Father Fargis, of Georgetown University, have each of them suggested methods of overcoming this difficulty by instrumental means. Father Fargis has eliminated the personal equation in transit observation by a photographic process. His method is an improvement upon the one with which Professors Pickering and Bigelow had been experimenting at Harvard, and it seems to solve the difficulty. Father Algue, of Manila, who was at Georgetown for some time, has invented a modification of this which promises much. Father Braun suggested the invention of the spectroheliograph for photographing the whole sun, with its spots and prominences. Father De Vico invented an instrumental device praised by Arago enabling observers to see the internal satellites of Saturn in telescopes much smaller than the one used by Herschel.

The literary activity of the new society has been quite up to the standard set by the old society. We have already called attention to the almost incredible labors of Father Secchi, but other great works deserve to be mentioned. Father Hagen's "Atlas of Variable Stars" is highly appreciated by astronomers everywhere, while his "Synopsis of the Higher Mathematics," in four volumes quarto, has a great reputation in the mathematical world. There has been a stamp of scholarliness in Jesuit astronomical work that has attracted widespread attention. Fathers Strassmeier and Epping, working together, the one as an Assyriologist, the other as an astrologer, upon Babylonian bricks containing astronomical data, have shown that the Babylonians knew even more about scientific astronomy than we were inclined to attribute to them. Father Kugler, of Alkenberg, in Holland, has added to this. Father Karl Braun, of Mariaschein,

¹¹ "L'Archipelago Filipino Por-Algunos Padres de la Misión de la Compañía De Jesús En Estas Islas," two volumes, Washington, the Government Printing Office, 1900.

Bohemia, has written books upon gravity and cosmogony that deserve even more attention than they have received, though they have been the subject of high praise from those who are best fitted to judge of their significance.

For those who know anything about this marvelous activity of the great Jesuit order in astronomical matters it is impossible to understand how any intelligent person with this data before him should continue to express the opinion that the Church has been opposed to the development of science, and, above all, astronomical science. The Jesuits are thoroughly representative of what is usually thought to be the most conservative element in the Church. They have been universally conceded to represent the mind of the Popes as closely as is possible. They are directly under the orders of the Pope, singly and as a body. If there was any tendency to discourage the development of astrology they would never have taken it up originally, and they surely would not have been allowed to devote so much time and so many of their most promising men to it for nearly three centuries. They began their work in astronomy nearly a century before the Galileo case. They were extremely active in it during the time when Galileo is supposed to have been so much persecuted. They continued their activity afterwards and have kept it up down to the present day. Their success is the pride of their own order and is looked upon as a bright jewel in the Church's crown by ecclesiastical authorities.

Those who think the Galileo incident so significant must either be ignorant of all this real history of astronomy or else they must have explained it away to their satisfaction as one of these pretenses which is supposed to be expressed by the word Jesuitism. If a pretense of interest in a science can enable men to accomplish as much of absolute scientific value as the Jesuits have done in astronomy, then what we want is more of such pretense and a lot more of these pretenders. Meantime the only conclusion must be that the story of what the Jesuits have done in astronomy before and after Galileo is the complete contradiction of practically all that is written with regard to the Church's opposition to science as exemplified by the Galileo case.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York, N. Y.

IN WONDERLAND WITH GILBERT KEITH CHESTERTON: A STUDY IN PARADOX.

"I wonder if I shall fall right *through* the earth! How funny it'll seem to come out among the people that walk with their heads downwards! The Antipathies, I think—"—Alice in Wonderland.

MY COPY of "Alice in Wonderland" is a vivid crimson with gold lettering on the back and a wonderful representation of a Cheshire cat on the front cover. Ever since my first perusal of the volume, when I dropped down the rabbit hole with Alice and made the acquaintance of the White Rabbit, the Duchess, the March Hare, the Hatter and the Dormouse, not to speak of the philosophy-loving Caterpillar and the Cat that could disappear progressively, beginning with its tail and ending with its grin—ever since that never-to-be-forgotten day I have had a weakness for red books with gilt letters on the back. I have just finished a collection of essays by Gilbert K. Chesterton called "Heretics,"* which is red enough and gold enough to satisfy my taste. But these are not the only points in which it resembles Lewis Carroll's masterpiece. The two opening chapters, one on "The Importance of Orthodoxy" and the other on "The Negative Spirit," are really two tunnels through which we drop down a chasm more mysterious than the famous rabbit hole which formed the dividing line between the real world and the wonderland of Alice's exciting adventures. If we decide to take the leap with Mr. Chesterton—and the paradoxes of this laughing philosopher are as irresistible to grown-ups as the White Rabbit's watch and waistcoat were to Alice—we find ourselves sinking suddenly and at last coming out where Alice feared her tumble would end—"among the people that walk with their heads downwards—the Antipathies." For that there is a distinction between right and wrong; that orthodoxy and heresy are absolute realities and not mere prejudices; that there is such a thing as standing on one's feet and seeing the world aright, and such a thing as standing on one's head and mirror-reading the universe—this is the contention on which the book is built, the pivot on which every one of the twenty chapters swings.

There has been too much levity, Mr. Chesterton thinks, on the subject of cosmic philosophy. We have talked of progress, of the relativity of knowledge, of science and empirical realities, until we have come to the conclusion that absolute reality and absolute truth are sheer adumbrations, the survival of phantoms created by the human mind in its myth-making and fetish-worshiping stages.

* "Heretics," Gilbert K. Chesterton. John Lane Company.

"General theories," as Mr. Chesterton says, "are everywhere condemned; the doctrine of the rights of man is dismissed with the doctrine of the fall of man. Atheism itself is too theological for us to-day. Revolution is too much of a system; liberty too much of a restraint. We will have no generalizations. . . . Everything matters, except everything." But why this fear of the infinite and the absolute? Are not the finite and the relative equally mysterious? To the din of voices assuring us that the absolute does not exist, or that if it does, it is forever unknowable and should be so denominated, with perhaps a capital letter for decency's sake, Chesterton asks in the words of the hookah-smoking Caterpillar: "What do you mean? Explain yourself. You! Who are *you*?" And since the credentials they produce fail to satisfy him, he decides that these noisy latter day prophets are nothing but common heretics—men who struggle vainly in a topsy-turvydom of their own creation. They are obsessed by what he calls "the negative spirit," the spirit that discerns weakness and failure, the spirit of disillusionment and dead ideals. "The eye that can perceive what are the wrong things increases in an uncanny and devouring clarity, while the eye which sees what things are right is growing mistier and mistier, till it goes almost blind with doubt. . . . To us light must be henceforth the dark thing—the thing of which we cannot speak. To us, as to Milton's devils in Pandemonium, it is darkness that is visible." And yet we talk of progress and modernism has become almost a religion.

Among the iconoclasts considered in this crimso-golden volume are Rudyard Kipling, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, George Moore, Tolstoy, Lowes Dickinson and Whistler. Kipling is a heretic because of his militarism. "The evil of militarism is that it shows most men to be tame and timid and excessively peaceable. . . . The military man gains the civil power in proportion as the civilian loses the military virtues. . . . Militarism demonstrated the decadence of Rome and it demonstrates the decadence of Prussia." Kipling reminds us of the Queen of Hearts, with her eternal "Off with her head; off with his head; off with all their heads." Bernard Shaw is a heretic because he cannot idealize; because he holds that "the golden rule is that there is no golden rule." He says to those who come to him for light what the Cheshire Cat said to Alice: "Oh, you are sure to get *somewhere* if you only walk long enough. In *that* direction lives a Hatter; and in *that* direction lives a March Hare. Visit either you like. They are both mad." H. G. Wells is affected with the great scientific fallacy, "the habit of beginning not with the human soul, which is the first thing man learns about, but with some such thing as protoplasm, which is about the last." Like the Duchess, he believes in facts, in everything that can be seen

or heard, touched or tasted. George Moore is a solipsist; his mania is a "dusty egotism." He is as self-centred as the White Rabbit, as interested in the figure he shall cut and the pose he shall strike. Tolstoy is banned because he lauds simplicity in externals, when "the only simplicity worth preserving is the simplicity of the heart. There is more simplicity in the man who eats caviar on impulse than there is in the man who eats grape nuts on principle." Is Tolstoy the Hatter? The Hatter was "a poor man," as he assured the King of Hearts three times over in the course of the famous trial concerning the stolen tarts. Besides, the Hatter lived on bread and butter and tea—a very simple diet. "Why is a raven like a writing desk?" asked the Hatter. But when Alice gave it up and called for the solution, he answered gravely: "I haven't the slightest idea." Tolstoy, too, is a master scoutsman in the matter of running down difficulties; but what one of our modern evils has he corralled and despatched? As for Lowes Dickinson, his advocacy of a return to paganism makes it plain that he is as mad as the March Hare and as unlikely to recover. Whistler, with all his merits, suffers from ingrown artistic temperament—a most painful disease. He must have drunk of "the little bottle without a label that stands near the looking-glass" in Wonderland, and, like Alice, he soon found his head pressing against the ceiling. He had become a great man in his own estimation.

"Curiouser and curiouser," we echo after Alice, as we wade deeper and deeper into the pool of modernism under the spell of the Chestertonian paradoxes. "Adventures are to the unadventurous." "No one can be really hilarious but the serious man." "Romance is deeper than reality." "We admire things with reasons, but love them without reasons." "It is the vague modern who is not at all certain what is right who is most certain that Dante was wrong." These are a few taken at random. Now, a paradox, if some faith is still to be put in dictionaries, is "a tenet or proposition contrary to received opinion; an assertion or sentiment seemingly contradictory or opposed to common sense; that which in appearance or terms is absurd, but yet may be true in fact." This apparent absurdity, this seeming contrariness is peculiarly characteristic of everything really worth while—of faith and hope and love; of truth and goodness and beauty; of life itself. We are far from the road that leads truthward until we have come to see that what we have been interpreting figuratively must be taken literally, while what we have supposed literal must be construed mystically. It is really true that the first shall be last and the last first; that he that seeketh his life shall lose it, while he that loses shall find forever. For in some mysterious way, in some deeper sense than we as yet understand,

the Cross lies at the very heart of things. Now, the Cross has always been to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Gentiles a scandal. The Cross cannot be rationalized, and yet there is nothing irrational about it. Or rather, as Mr. Chesterton tells us, it is understood of the people just because it is non-rational. "A page of statistics, a plan of model dwellings, anything which is rational, is always difficult for the lay mind. But the thing which is irrational anybody can understand. . . . That is why religion came so early into the world and spread so far, while science came so late and has not spread at all."

With this gay challenge to the eristic of the logicians, G. K. C. fares forth to battle for the truth. And the first fact he seeks to establish is that there is such a thing as truth. "A man with a definite belief always appears bizarre," he tells us, "because he does not change with the world; he has climbed into a fixed star, and the earth whizzes below him like a zoetrope." But let it whizz, is his advice; do you stand still. The men who have done things in this world have been dogmatists every one. The modern idea that mental growth is in some way connected with the breaking of bonds and the overthrow of dogmas is all wrong. "If there is such a thing as mental growth it must mean the growth into more and more definite convictions, into more and more dogmas" He has no use for those writers and thinkers who try to get over this difficulty by talking about "aspects of truth," as if one could recognize the aspects of something he had never seen or known. "If we talk of a certain thing being an aspect of truth, it is evident that we claim to know what truth is, just as, if we talk of the hind leg of a dog, we claim to know what a dog is." But the age is afraid of universal truths and dogmatic certainties; or, rather, as Chesterton suggests, it is fearful lest a belief in absolute verities might make bigots and fanatics out of us. But this view, he insists, is itself founded upon a bigoted prejudice. "In real life the people who are most bigoted are the people who have no convictions at all. . . . Bigotry may be defined as the anger of men who have no opinions. It is the resistance offered to definite ideas by that vast bulk of people whose ideas are indefinite to excess. Bigotry may be defined as the frenzy of the indifferent." And fanaticism, instead of being the obstinately headlong pursuit of an ideal, is a distemper peculiar to men who have no ideals. "It is precisely because an ideal is necessary to man that the man without ideals is in permanent danger of fanaticism. . . . Religious and philosophical beliefs are, indeed, as dangerous as fire, and nothing can take from them that beauty of danger. But there is only one way of guarding ourselves against the excessive danger of them, and that is to be steeped in philosophy and soaked in religion."

Now the Middle Ages above all others were "steeped in philosophy and soaked in religion." Time was when the history-mongers dubbed these ages "dark." But that day is passed. The term mediæval is coming to be synonymous with luminous. It is modernism that we associate with mediocrity, grayness, averages, dead levels of all sorts. Chesterton is a mediævalist. "If we compare," he says, "the morality of Ibsen's 'ghosts' with that of the 'Divine Comedy' we shall see all that modernism has really done. No one, I imagine, will accuse the author of the 'Inferno' of an early Victorian prudishness or a Podsnapian optimism. But Dante describes three moral instruments—Heaven, Purgatory and Hell, the vision of perfection, the vision of improvement and the vision of failure. Ibsen has only one—Hell." This inability to conceive perfection, this skepticism concerning ideals is essentially neoteric. In the Middle Ages it was imperfection that was considered incomprehensible. It may be, as Mr. Chesterton suggests, that the monks of that age overdid the contemplation of ideal wholeness and happiness; it may be that they neglected important things for a dream-world, an unreality. But still, as Chesterton insists, it was wholeness and happiness they were contemplating. If they went mad, it was for the love of sanity. "But the modern student of ethics, even if he remains sane, remains sane from an insane dread of insanity. The anchorite rolling on the stones in a frenzy of submission is a healthier person fundamentally than many a sober man in a silk hat who is walking down Cheapside. For many such are good only through a withering knowledge of evil." We have too much respect for silk hats, Mr. Chesterton thinks; too much respect for the moneyed and the educated classes. A little of the early Franciscan love of poverty would be good for us. "We are always ready," he says, "to make a saint or a prophet of the educated man who goes into cottages to give a little kindly advice to the uneducated. But the mediæval idea of a saint was something quite different. The mediæval saint or prophet was an uneducated man who walked into grand houses to give a little kindly advice to the educated." It is probable that the educated are in as much need of a little kindly advice in the twentieth century as they were in the twelfth, but there seems to be a dearth of saints and prophets.

Mediævalism means optimism; ages of faith are ages of joy. As we should expect, the author of "Heretics" is an optimist. "Wherever you have belief," he tells us, "you will have hilarity. Leisure and larkiness always have a religious origin." But this does not imply a hedonistic ethics; quite the contrary. "Great joy does not gather the roses while it may; its eyes are fixed on the immortal rose that Dante saw. Great joy has in it the sense of immortality."

The Greeks accidentally hit upon the end-as-happiness standard, and then deliberately set it up as the worthwhile goal of human activity. "The pagan determined with admirable sense," Chesterton points out, "to enjoy himself. But by the end of his civilization he had discovered that a man cannot enjoy himself and continue to enjoy anything else." The conscious quest of the delightful always ends in misery. Not the seeking of pleasure, but the abiding belief that back of all that is incomplete and inexplicable, back of the apparent failure of goodness and the flamboyant victories of evil, there is a will that wills righteousness and a power that sustains virtue—this it is that validates forever our ethical ideals and aspirations. We must believe that the heart of the universe is good before we can be really happy. We must see, as Chesterton says, that there is "an eternal gaiety in the nature of things." "About the whole cosmos," he confides to us in a jubilant aside, "there is an air of tense and secret festivity like preparations for a great holiday. Eternity is the eve of something. I never look up at the stars without feeling that they are the fires of a schoolboy's rocket fixed in their everlasting fall."

This idea that "eternity is the eve of something" implies belief in personal immortality and the acceptance of what is called "the two-world system of philosophy." Personality is the deepest fact we know. Immortality without the persistence of personality is as inconceivable as it would be undesirable. All the talk we hear of Humanity with a capital H, and of Society with a capital S, all the metaphors concerning a universal will and a universal consciousness are, to quote Chesterton, "so many pseudo-scientific attempts to conceal from men the awful liberty of their lonely souls." We must accept this fact of our own ultimateness and the responsibility of the freedom of our wills whether we like it or not. We can never again be satisfied with the Oriental ideal of passivity, of absorption into Nirvana. We are done with the philosophy of the Rubáiyát. The teachings of the Son of the Carpenter cannot be reconciled with those of the Persian tentmaker. We see at last that a theism which denies the reality of the human will and the finality of human personality is little better than atheism. "The real objection which a Christian should bring against the religion of Omar," Chesterton urges, "is not that he gives no place to God, but that he gives too much place to God.

"The ball no question makes of Ayes or Noes,
But Here or There as strikes the Player goes;
And He that tossed you down into the field,
He knows about it all—he knows—he knows.

A Christian thinker, such as Augustine or Dante, would object to this because it ignores free-will, which is the valor and dignity

of the soul. The quarrel of the highest Christianity with this skepticism is not in the least that the skepticism denies the existence of God; it is that it denies the existence of man." We must keep a place for ourselves in our theory of the uni-verse. Perhaps, in order to retain our own significance we shall have to give up the unification ideal, for which science has struggled so long and so valiantly, and be content to live in what James calls a "multi-verse." But no matter what the cost, we shall gladly pay it, if thereby we may vindicate the dignity and reality of the human soul.

Mediævalism, optimism and faith in humanity—these are the corner-stones on which Chesterton builds his temple of orthodoxy. Out of his mediævalism springs his admiration for the Church of the Middle Ages, the Church that produced a Dante, a Thomas Aquinas, a Francis of Assisi. "When Christ at a symbolic moment was establishing His great society," he observes, "He chose for its corner-stone neither the brilliant Paul nor the mystic John, but the one who had failed in the hour of need, a coward—in a word, a man. And on this rock He has built His Church, and the gates of hell have not prevailed against it. All the empires and kingdoms of the world have failed because of this inherent and continual weakness, that they were founded by strong men and upon strong men. But this one thing, the historic Christian Church, was founded on a weak man, and for that reason it is indestructible." Out of his optimism comes his proclamation of the poetry of the commonplace, the glorification of the ordinary. He has a childlike power of appreciation, a child's capacity for enjoyment. "The child is, indeed, in these, as in many other matters, our best guide," he tells us. "And in nothing is the child so righteously childlike, in nothing does he exhibit more accurately the sounder order of simplicity than in the fact he sees everything with a simple pleasure, even the complex things. To the child the tree and the lamp-post are as natural and as artificial as each other; or, rather, neither of them is natural, but both are supernatural. The flower with which God crowns one and the flame with which Sam the lamplighter crowns the other are equally of the gold of fairy tales." Out of his faith in humanity he evolves his disdain for science and its world-machine; for naturalism in philosophy, opportunism in politics, realism in art and rationalism in religion. "The Middle Ages, with a great deal more sense than it would now be fashionable to admit," he says, "regarded natural history at bottom rather as a kind of joke; they regarded the soul as very important." After all, it is as true to-day as it was in Plato's time that the proper study of mankind is man. "Not that I mean to say anything disparaging of any one who is a student of natural philosophy," Socrates says, or was it Plato?

"but the simple truth is, O Athenians, that I have nothing to do with these studies."

We are beginning now to speak of the failure of science, but it was we who failed in expecting too much of it. The key to the universe, the solution to the tantalizing mystery of the Sphinx, like the tarts made by the Queen of Hearts, has been stolen "quite away." And our attempts to recover the lost key have been every bit as ridiculous as the trial conducted by the King of Hearts, with the White Rabbit as herald of the accusation and all the principal characters of Wonderland in the jury-box.

"What do you know about this business?" the King said to Alice.

"Nothing," said Alice.

"Nothing *whatever?*" persisted the King.

"Nothing whatever," said Alice.

"That's very important," the King said, turning to the jury.

"Unimportant, your Majesty means, of course," interrupted the White Rabbit.

"Unimportant, of course, I meant," the King hastily said. "Consider your verdict," he commanded the jury in a low, trembling voice.

"There's more evidence to come in yet, please your Majesty," said the White Rabbit, jumping up in a great hurry. "This paper has just been fixed up."

The new evidence was presented.

"Sentence first—verdict afterwards," said the Queen.

"Stuff and nonsense!" said Alice loudly. "The idea of having the verdict first!"

"Off with her head!" the Queen shouted at the top of her voice. Nobody moved.

"Who cares for you?" was Alice's reply, her final taunt, flung full in the face of assembled Wonderland. "You're nothing but a pack of cards!"

This is Chesterton's ultimate conclusion concerning the curious band of decadents he has grouped under the heading "Heretics." They are nothing but a pack of cards.

It is nearly three years since "Heretics" was published. The orthodoxies it defended and the heresies it condemned are still locked in a deadly struggle. Chesterton is young—only thirty-three. It may be that he will live to witness the convalescence and eventual recuperation of his heretical brothers. It is only eight years since he printed his first book, "Graybeards at Play," a volume of fantastic verse. This was followed by "The Wild Knight," with its serious poetry, its hints of unsuspected depths. Then came "The Defendant," "Varied Types" and "The Napoleon of Notting Hill."

Incidentally there were essays, reviews and polemics without end in the magazines and in the *Daily News* and the *Speaker*. "A madman raving in an insanity of paradox," was the verdict of certain staid ones among the critics. "The most vital force in English journalism," "the clearest visioned of the moderns," "a youth turning somersaults over the tombstones of the dead," was the decision in other quarters. And then people began to ask who this Gilbert Keith Chesterton might be. That was in 1905. His friend and fellow-liberal, Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, hastened to enlighten them. G. K. C. was a Liberal in politics and what is called an Anglican "Catholic" in religion. He was born in London and educated at St. Paul's. When he left school he intended to be an artist, and still has a weakness for sketching in crayon. He wears a large slouch hat, which is the despair of his friends, and is given to long walks through the heart of London. He is a member of the Anti-Puritan League for the defense of the people's pleasures; he hates with an abiding hatred the philosophy of George Bernard Shaw and the Fabians; he is a good fighter and "loves the very breath of controversy."

He gravely argues No means Yes;
He shows that joy is deep distress.

* * * * *

He tells you soap is made of cheese,
And any well-known truth you please.
He proves with most consummate ease
Confoundedly confutable.

There is something peculiarly soul-satisfying about being the champion of a forlorn hope; there is something thrillingly exhilarating about the defense of a lost cause. We all smile at Don Quixote, but we all love him. Chesterton may be a visionary, but his is a glorious vision. Like his own "Wild Knight," he fares forth, a seeker after God. And ever as he journeys on he sings the song the "Wild Knight" sang as he rode:

So with the wan waste grasses on my spear
I ride forever seeking after God.
My hair grows whiter than my thistle plume,
And all my limbs are loose; but in my eyes
The star of an unconquerable praise.
For in my soul one hope forever sings,
That at the next white corner of a road
My eyes may look on Him.

M. A. DUNNE.

Chicago, Ill.

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF PIUS X.

TWENTY years ago Catholic Christendom was celebrating the golden jubilee of the Thirteenth Leo. All eyes were then turned towards the ripe scholar, the experienced statesman who was shedding lustre on the chair of Peter. To-day the same Church Universal is celebrating all over the world a similar joyous anniversary of a Pope of another type, who in the less than half dozen years of his Pontificate has succeeded in drawing admiration to his high office and loyalty to his person to a degree probably never surpassed in the annals of the See of Rome. He came to his position of incomparable dignity by the almost visible action of the Divine Spirit on the minds of those whose votes the tears of his humility sought in vain to alter. He brought to it no showy antecedents known to the world outside. He was the scion not of a palace, but of a cottage; yet the blood in his veins was none the less pure because it was not princely. He had written no books; his name was unknown to the pages of even the reviews of ecclesiastical science, but his training in the ordinary curriculum, supplemented by constant study and providentially perfected by labors as professor and president of a seminary, had fully equipped him with the knowledge and balance of mind well suited to direct the researches of experts. It is not at all necessary that a Pope be a specialist in any branch of knowledge; yea, from some points of view it is better that he should not be so, but rather be unhampered by any special predilection in facing the various problems and phases of problems which come before him for decision—just as in some national administrations, in England, for instance, it is thought best to have the Secretary of State for War not a military man, but a civilian, whose judgment will be less biased by expert theories. What is necessary is that the Pope should have a solid fund of knowledge of all the subjects with which his sacred office may bring him in touch, and a sound mind, which will readily receive the enlightenment and assistance of the Holy Ghost. This clearness of mind and soundness of judgment are possessed in an eminent degree by the elect of the last conclave, as the event has proved, notably in the encyclical on Modernism. Again, the Patriarch of Venice became present to the minds of the Cardinals on that day of August, 1903, not as a trained diplomat versed in the astute ways of the world's politicians, but none the less strong, wise and fearless to defend his Master's kingdom, as anti-Christian statecraft has since learnt to its cost. But what most attracted the favorable notice of the conclave was the combined humility and piety, gentleness and firmness of the character, as well as the consistent, fruitful

career of Cardinal Sarto as priest, pastor, Bishop and Patriarch. His brother Cardinals were led by the Divine Spirit to see in him the "man of God" providentially equipped to guide the Church through the difficult times now pressing upon her. Power and influence in the Old World are passing away rapidly from their ancient depositaries of high estate to the common people. The Church has no occasion to fear this transition; she is the Church of the people, the Body of Him who cast His lot and hers among the common throng of the poor and lowly. None the less, it has been no easy matter for the Church in Europe to adjust herself to the new status that has arisen for her, through the loss of the temporal power and the unloosening of the many ties which bound her to the courts and governments of the Continent. Such a situation called to the chair of Peter a man of the people, who, clothed in the divine authority of the Papal office, would set himself resolutely to one task alone, the same for which Peter had been raised up—to guide and safeguard, to feed and cherish the flock redeemed and committed to his keeping by the Divine Shepherd, Christ.

The past five years have justified the wisdom of those who elected Pius X. Perhaps never in the long history of the Church have so many and serious difficulties cropped up in the course of so few years, and never, too, has a Pope crowded into so narrow a space so many and far-reaching acts of Pontifical authority. Circumstances over which he had no control created the difficulties of the situation. The personal character of the man, informed by the Divine prerogatives of his office, has known how to solve these difficulties and take measures to prevent their recurrence. The two very first acts of the new Pontiff—the choosing of a name and the adoption of a motto—indicated the set purpose of his reign—a purpose which has since found ample field for its activity. He chose to be called Pius and he adopted for his motto the words of St. Paul, "Instaurare omnia in Christo." The Popes named Pius stand forth in the history of the Church in a very marked manner as the saintly and intrepid defenders of purity of doctrine and of the Church's divine organization and prerogatives. To speak of the later ones only: There was St. Pius V., who gave practical effect to the Council of Trent and saved Christendom from the Mahomedans; there was Pius VI., who fought heroically against Josephism in Austria and against the civil constitution of the clergy in France, and who died a martyr to principle; there was Pius VII., who was called to resist the mighty Napoleon in defense of the Church's laws concerning marriage as well as of the rights of the Holy See, and, last of all, was Pius IX., the great Pontiff who was raised up and long preserved by God to bridge over the transition from the old

order of European society to the new, while reasserting in the face of liberalism the unchangeableness of the faith, the divine origin of the Church's organization, the supremacy of its Head.

Those great Popes who bore the name of Pius were, we know, present to the mind of Pius X. when he chose his title, and their line of action was adopted as his own should occasion arise. To guard at all hazards the integrity of the deposit of the faith, to preserve intact the Church's organization, to bring her closer and closer to her Divine Master, Christ, through the restoration of the primitive fervor of frequent communion—this was evidently the fixed purpose of the newly elected Pontiff when he chose Pius for his name and "to reestablish all things in Christ" for his motto.

Providence has provided during the past five years a very fruitful field for the display of the high purposes of Pius X. He has had occasion to defend the deposit of the faith from the most insidious attacks from within the very fold; he has had to uphold the unchangeable organization and independence of the Church against the hostile machinations of an infidel government, and he has steadily kept in view the encouragement and development of a higher spiritual life within the Church. This twofold purpose steadily and zealously pursued realizes the saying of the reputed prophecy which designates him as "Ignis Ardens," a column of fire shedding light and warmth all around and fanned continuously by the charity of Christ.

The primary and most important duty of every Pope is to keep the light of faith shining in all its pristine brightness; to keep and safeguard the deposit of revelation committed to the Church. This is the very *raison d'être* of his office. For faith is, as St. Thomas teaches, the first of virtues in the order of generation, though not in the order of excellence, where charity reigns supreme; or, as the Council of Trent puts it, "Faith is the root and foundation of our justification;" for by faith we know God and knowledge must precede love. Now, to preserve the unity and integrity of the faith there must be one supreme teacher in the Church with the office and mission to teach authoritatively and infallibly. Otherwise there would be the variations of every wind of doctrine, the disintegration expressed by the proverb, "Quot homines, tot sententiae."

There is scarcely any period in the Church's history in which attacks of one kind or another have not been made on the faith. These attacks have varied in form and in origin, but in substance they have ever been the same emanations of the pride of intellect rebelling against the acceptance of "the things unseen." But it was left for our day and for the present Pope to have to deal with a determined and well ordered design on the part of professing Cath-

olic writers and thinkers to strive to reconcile the dogmas and discipline of the Church with the vagaries of current historico criticism and philosophy. It was, indeed, an apparently plausible though ambitious scheme to capture the swelling tide of rationalism, which had engulfed the Protestantism which had produced it and to mingle it with the clear, placid stream of the faith and tradition of ages. This union would have entailed the whittling down of dogma to a merely subjective and variable mode of thought; it would have sapped the very foundations of belief and made man's individual consciousness the final arbiter of revelation. Those who set on foot this movement known as Modernism failed, or did not trouble themselves to see that its ultimate issue would be the destruction of Catholicism, as it had already eaten up its foolish parent, Protestantism. But Pius X. was on the alert, and he fearlessly fulminated against this new synthesis of all the heresies of the past an encyclical letter, which for lucid exposition, close reasoning and irrefutable conclusions ranks among the most far-reaching documents ever issued by a Pope. It required absolute fearlessness and sureness of his ground to send forth the encyclical on Modernism. These qualities the Divine Spirit easily formed on the groundwork of Pius X.'s natural strength of character and soundness of judgment. The Pope had already given proof of both those high qualities in his brief of June, 1907, to Dr. Commer, of Vienna, congratulating him on his refutation of the late Dr. Schell, of Wurzburg, to whom his modernist admirers were about to erect a monument of glorification, notwithstanding the fact that his writings had been condemned by the Holy See. This brief, which the Pope ordered to be published, came as a thunderbolt on the haughty professors of Wurzburg and elsewhere, who had been sedulously fomenting contempt for the ordinances of the Holy See. But the good result was immediate and complete. The backing of Modernism in Germany was effectively broken. It remained for the great encyclical of the following September to squelch the hydra in every part of the Catholic world where it had protruded its noisome head. And this squelching has been so thorough that it is safe to prognosticate that Modernism will not be again heard of within the Church.

Nor has the Pope been wanting in constructive work in connection with his office as supreme teacher of the faithful. His creation of a special doctorate in Scripture on November 9, 1903, and his letter on the study of Scripture in March, 1906, show his desire for the prosecution of higher studies in this all important subject. And his encyclical on Christian doctrine, issued in April, 1905, showed the practical bent of his mind and has been an encouragement and incentive to pastors as well as to catechists throughout the world.

Moreover, in his encyclical on Modernism he has definitely promised the establishment of a higher institute of studies suited to meet the requirements of modern science.

The second chief feature of the Pontificate of Pius X. has been his noble, uncompromising defense of the divine organization of the Church and of the inalienable rights of the Holy See against the iniquitous designs of the present anti-Christian Government of France. It would seem to be for this special purpose that he was raised up by God. His own vision of what was in store for him when he assumed the name of Pius proved prophetic. He found himself in presence of a situation more complex and embarrassing than that which confronted Pius VI. mid the full flow of the tide of Revolution, or Pius VII. resisting to the face the conqueror of Europe. To break definitely with the Government of France, the "eldest daughter" and the right arm of the Church for fifteen hundred years; to advise the French clergy and laity to sacrifice all, even the salvage of partial compensation to be gathered from the wreck—this was the formidable issue which confronted Pius X. in the third year of his Pontificate. The whole world knows how calmly and fearlessly and wisely he met the situation. He did not court the breaking of the Concordat, which with all its defects had given a tolerable amount of religious peace to France for over a hundred years, but if the French Government picked a quarrel to break it, then the separation must be complete; no further gilded chains would be accepted. In other words, the Pope determined to uphold in all its integrity the divine organization of the Church, and consent to no weakening of the links which her Divine Founder welded together to bind pastor and flock to one another without any intermediate interference on the part of State or potentate. Not only Catholics, but right thinking men everywhere applauded what the *Saturday Review*, of England, called "the stand taken by Pius X.," a stand which it maintained was wise and necessary and for which the entire Christian world was beholden to the Pope.

The decision of the Pope in this matter entailed, of course, dire temporal distress for the Church of France. She found herself at one fell blow on the part of the government deprived of her revenues, her properties, her equipments, her charitable foundations and brought to a state of poverty like unto that of the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem, with similar enemies raging around her on every side. But the Bishops, clergy and laity of Catholic France, the descendants of so many countless martyrs and confessors, rose to the occasion, swore to follow where Pius led and thereby sealed forever the noble traditions of their apostolic spirit. The act of Pius X. has broken once for all the shackles that bound the Church of France so long

to the chariot of a State which had become openly anti-Christian. Freedom in poverty is better than slavery in abundance. A new fire is enkindled in France, and it is bound to go on increasing unto the perfect day of full religious freedom and development. For this the French Church historian of the future will glorify the name of Pius X.

In the sphere of the interior discipline and life of the Church the Pontificate of Pius X. has been hitherto marvelously active and fruitful. The unusually large number of his *motu proprios* and *encyclicals* attest his activity, and his energy does not cease with the publication of his wishes, but he takes effective measures for securing their being carried out. One of his first concerns in disciplinary matters was the music and singing used in the celebration of the Divine Mysteries and in the other offices of the Church. In his letter to Cardinal Fischer, and especially in his *motu proprio* of November, 1905, he enjoined the use of plain chant in the Church's offices and the exclusion of women from church choirs. This was but a returning to the ancient discipline which enabled the people through the use of plain music and song to take a live part in the holy mysteries. There was in the ancient times in the Latin Church a continuous commingling of the prayers of the people with those of the celebrant, similar to that which still obtains in the liturgies of the Greek Church. One of the many bad results of the persecutions consequent on the revolt of the sixteenth century was the breaking up of the old Catholic tradition in English-speaking countries. For centuries the Low Mass was as much as could be secured in the face of the priest hunters, and the long cessation of High Masses has left its mark upon us. When the more solemn ceremonies were restored the ancient music traditions were lost and theatrical rather than congregational singing got into vogue. The result has been that in many places the High Mass was apparently little more than a sacred oratorio calculated to tickle the ears of the theatre-goers. Against this abuse Pius X. has protested, and the carrying out of his ordinances will enable the faithful to have a more immediate and pious participation in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice.

In other matters of a disciplinary character, such as the regulations for seminaries, the founding of religious congregations, the mode of action of Catholic associations, Pius X. has exercised unusual vigilance. But there are three measures especially which will leave his practical and determined character indelibly imprinted on the discipline of the Church. These are the codification of the canon law, the readjustment of the functions of the several Roman congregations and the regulation of the marriage laws. It is said that

wise churchmen have long sighed for these measures, but the difficulties in the way of carrying them out seemed insuperable. But the word "impossible," when applied to useful measures for the good of the Church and the glory of God, is unknown to the sturdy mind of Pius X. In a short time a new and more up-to-date order will reign over the higher central administration of the Church; her laws, the product of the experience of ages, will speak with one voice in all parts of the world, and the only marriages of her own children which she will recognize are those which she herself has witnessed and blessed.

It is easy to see the comprehensive character and the far-reaching effects of these disciplinary measures. They affect all categories of the Church's members, from the Cardinals of the Curia down to the humblest adult, and their ultimate effect must be to emphasize and safeguard more and more the independence of the Church's organism, such as she possessed and claimed for it in the beginning.

All these measures taken by Pius X. for the preservation of the deposit of the faith and the safeguarding of the Church's organization and internal discipline have for him as for every Pope one final purpose—the preserving and cherishing the spiritual life of the Church, just as the final purport of our Divine Lord's life was that we "may have life and have it more abundantly." The salvation of the souls of its members is the sole purpose for which the Church exists. And this truth, in all its apostolic simpleness, has been ever present to the mind of Pius X.; it is covered by his motto, "In-staurare omnia in Christo." To restore all things in Christ, to have the Divine Master rule over all the Church's activities, to have Him live in every one of her members is the sublime aim of the "Papa Pastorale" who now sits on the chair of Peter. It is in active pursuit of this ideal that he issued in December, 1905, his immortal decree, "Sacra Tridentina Synodus," whereby he threw open to all the faithful frequent, yea, daily Communion, and invited them thus to renew in themselves and in the Church the life and fervor of the early Christians. Pius X. will be known to history as the Pope of the Eucharist. He has put into fresh relief the great truth that what the Church, the Body of Christ, most needs at all times is close union with its Head, the Author of Life, and this union is effected in the most real, true and substantial manner by partaking of the very Bread of Life in Holy Communion. The decree under consideration has put an end forever to the controversies that have existed for ages concerning the advisability and the conditions of frequent Communion. It rightly styles the Blessed Sacrament the "Divinum Pharmacum," the Divine remedy for our weakness, not the reward of merit. It states that "the primary purpose of the

Sacrament of the Eucharist is not that the honor and reverence due to our Lord may be safeguarded, but that it may serve as an antidote whereby we are delivered from daily faults and preserved from deadly sins." And the decree adds that it is "the desire of Jesus Christ and of the Church that all the faithful should daily approach the sacred banquet." The only conditions laid down are freedom from grievous sin and from unworthy motives, and confessors are enjoined not to dissuade from even daily Communion the penitents who fulfill these conditions.

This epoch-making decree, which has for special purpose to revive the practice of the early Christians, which it declares to have been that of daily Communion, will necessarily have for effect to increase very largely the spiritual life and vigor of the Church. And there never was a period in her history when this increase of strength from on high was so much needed by her. As the world grows older in its worldliness the Church is being more and more isolated as the one impregnable rampart against the forces of evil. What recks the world of any of the multitudinous sects who claim to stand up against it? They are brushed aside with silent contempt. The Catholic Church alone is the enemy to be counted with, and against her the gates of hell are being opened with ever increasing violence. Thank God, her house is firmly fixed on the rock against which no tempests will prevail. But her indwellers as well as her defenders need an increase of warmth and strength in proportion to the bitterness of the storm outside. This they receive in all abundance in the Holy Eucharist. And for this increase to the full measure of daily food they are beholden to the divinely inspired Pius X.

We have touched briefly and on a few only of the many measures, policies and acts of Pius X. The time is not yet come for taking a deeper and more comprehensive view of his Pontificate. But already the fruits of his energy and single-mindedness are being gathered into the granary of God's kingdom on earth, and if he were to disappear to-morrow his short reign of a little over five years would be indelibly impressed on the history of the Church. The abundance of the harvest already gathered is due in no inconsiderable measure to the loyalty and intelligence of those whom his wisdom has chosen to aid him. Foremost among these ranks the marvelous young churchman whom Pius chose for the highest post in his official household. The choice itself was characteristic of the penetrating wisdom and fearless courage of the Pope. How many arguments the wiseacres could put forth against appointing a young man less than forty years old to the second highest office in the Church—that of Secretary of State to the Supreme Pontiff! Here again the event has justified the far-seeing wisdom of the Holy

Father. There was probably in Christendom no other man so well suited to serve and second the providential work of this Pontificate as Raphael Merry del Val. His noble Spanish and Irish blood, his English birth and training, his intimate knowledge and experience of the languages and ecclesiastical affairs of all the great Christian nations were heaven-sent gifts to be placed at the service of a Pope who had never traveled outside his native land and who knew no modern language but that of Italy. Yet it was not these exceptional gifts so much as similarity of character and aim which served as the loadstone to attract those two noble minds to one another. Those who knew the young Secretary of the conclave most intimately admired him not so much for his rare hereditary and acquired gifts of the natural order as for his unfeigned piety and boundless charity. The same apostolic spirit which the youthful Father Sarto had displayed as curate at Trombolo, as pastor at Salzano, as spiritual director and chancellor at Treviso, and which he perfected as Bishop at Mantua and as Patriarch at Venice, found a very close reproduction of itself in the piety, zeal and charity of the young, noble, highly cultured Monsignor, who was known to spend himself in preaching the Gospel to the poor, in catechizing neglected children and in winning back the wayward of low and high degree. It was but natural that two such minds should be attracted to one another. And so it happened during the conclave. The new Pope manifested his esteem and confidence by appointing the secretary of the conclave his Pro-Secretary of State. The closer acquaintance of the following months confirmed this mutual esteem and affection, which found expression in the letter of definite appointment dated October 18, 1903, in which the Pope said: "The vote of the eminent Cardinals who elected you secretary of the conclave, the kindness which led you to accept and sustain in those days the cares of the Secretary of State and the affectionate earnestness with which you have fulfilled the very delicate office oblige me to ask you to assume definitely the office of my Secretary of State." This appointment carries the mind back to the almost identical circumstances of the appointment of Gonsalvi by Pius VII. And the best proof of the wisdom of the appointment is the fact that the enemies of the Church, the Free-mason Liberals of Europe, regard the eminent Secretary of State as the *bete noire* of the present Pontificate. But there has not been a Catholic gathering, occasion or work of any importance in any part of the world these past five years which has not been the recipient of the blessing and of the fatherly interest of Pius X. conveyed in the comely phrases of his cultured and indefatigable Secretary of State, whose name is indelibly connected with his in every Catholic heart.

The golden jubilee of the priesthood of Pius X. is drawing out from the whole Church renewed expressions of loyalty to his sacred office and person, and even the world outside has learnt to admire his great personality, the mingling of gentleness and strength, of unswerving faith and unlimited charity which embraces all men and all interests in the love of his Master, Christ. There is, however, a certain tinge of sadness mingled with the joy of such a celebration. For the very length of years that forms the vista of the past seems to shut out the hope of a long vista in the future. It is a noted fact in the life of Pius X. hitherto that the number nine has marked the several stages of his career. He was nine years curate, nine years parish priest, nine years chancellor, nine years Bishop, nine years Cardinal Patriarch, and now he is in the sixth year of his Pontificate. A prayer rises up to-day from every heart in Christendom that this last stage of his life may be prolonged threefold, and that, like his two immortal predecessors, he may see the days of Peter, and see still more of the fruits of his labors to restore all things in Christ.

JOHN T. MURPHY, C. S. Sp.

Cornwells, Pa.

THE USES AND SCOPE OF HISTORICAL READING.

“**G**IVE a man a taste for reading and the means of gratifying it and you can hardly fail of making a happy man, unless, indeed, you put into his hand a most perverse selection of books. You place him in contact with the best society in every period in history.” It were a thing very much to be desired to see every member of our extensive reading public heed this salutary advice of Sir Herschel. In that event the number of desultory readers would be reduced, popular literature would be relieved of much that is worthless and the taste of the reading public would be vastly improved. However, if our reading is to be no superficial and time-killing occupation, it must cover such topics as will naturally lead the mind to examine and apply what passes before its vision. Light, frivolous novels or romantic tales picturing exaggerated, unreal scenes will hardly induce the reader to pause and to gather useful information, but they will rather blunt and dissipate his mental energies. Our minds, like our limbs and physical powers, are strengthened by vigorous and judicious exercise. Poetry and well selected works of fiction store the mind with noble images and

yield the most exquisite, versatile expression of thought. Yet they will hardly call for a vigorous exercise of the critical and speculative faculties. These are more apt to be drawn out when the mind occupies itself with things of universal interest. Such subjects are, for instance, man's struggles and trials, his reverses and successes, his aspirations and disappointments. All these considerations fall within the domain of history. Hence it is that this branch of knowledge furnishes most useful and valuable reading. Since, however, history has within the past decades—thanks to the epoch-making publications of Niebuhr, Ranke, Janssen, Pastor, Lingard and Cantù—been elevated to the dignity of a science, the perusal of it must of necessity be conducted along critical lines.

Like every other science, history has passed through various phases of development. In the days of Herodotus it was little beyond a bare recital of interesting events. It confined itself to the relation of such facts as were likely to engage the imagination and to elicit sentiments of admiration and reverence. Thus it merely responded to a certain æsthetic interest in the marvelous events which occurred in the hazy past and, by consequence, took on the form of the narrative. But with the progress of civilization men began to gather practical lessons from the records of the past. The causes of friendships and enmities between nations, of the mutual relations of States and colonies, of treaties and agreements were looked for in the transactions of former generations. Men inquired into the causes of events and traced the motives of actions until they began to seek, from the course of events, practical rules to regulate the affairs of State and guiding principles for the maintenance of a healthy national and moral life.¹ Of this pragmatic form of historical writing Thucydides is the first exponent. A higher species is that which deals with historic events with a view to ascertaining their origin and their relation to each other in the continuous development of mankind. The unity of the human race and the intrinsic interdependence of all occurrences conspiring to form a continuity of progress constitute the fundamental principles according to which all events are valued.

The genetic form of history took its rise in the second half of the last century and differs from the narrative and pragmatic both in the method of treatment and in the quality of style adopted. It is but natural that the historian vary his manner of style according to the subject-matter in hand. If he presents facts and occurrences he employs the narrative style. This manner of style is most commonly in use among historians. If the narrative pauses to depict a battle or landscape, to describe a city or national hero, the language

¹ Cf. Bernheim, "Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode," p. 22.

becomes more vivid and is known as the pictorial style. Finally, when events have been recounted and scenes described, the historian draws inferences, assigns causes and points out consequences. This form of treatment constitutes the philosophical style.²

In addition to these forms of style, there is a fourth, the imaginative. This is intimately connected with the narrative and pictorial styles. As the name imports, it avails itself of the imagination not to dress up the heroes and ideas of former times in fantastic perfections, but to present a lifelike and vivid account of the past by means of the present. It also has recourse to the philosophical style, seeing that "It recognizes more distinctly the truth that all historic events are to be explained by certain causal influences or agencies which are furnished in man's own nature in the circumstances of his condition and in the purposes of the living God."³

To accurately determine the presence and operation of these causes is the province of what is known as the philosophy of history. To many this term "suggests something very profound, attractive and incomprehensible."⁴ Yet there should be no difficulty in the term. If a study of the universe, of its origin and nature, of its laws and properties is possible there is no reason why the human mind should be unable to deduce general principles from a succession of particular facts. To deny to man the prerogative of investigating the factors of development, of analyzing the causes of human actions and of tracing the results of historic events were to question the capabilities of the human mind, which, so far from being trammelled by the phenomena of sense, is by nature prone to follow up all things to their last causes. As a matter of fact, there have been eminent thinkers and profound historians who possessed and so cultivated the power of analysis as to be able to discover with subtlety and precision the most recondite causes of human conduct and the most secret springs of national acts. This is in part what the philosophy of history justly endeavors to achieve.

It would, then, appear that the science of history as pursued in modern times consists preëminently in the genetic form which aims at presenting events in their bearings on the continuous development of mankind. Some thinkers and critics, we are aware, persist in denying to history the distinction of being a science on the ground that it is rather an art. It does not proceed along strictly defined laws of its own, so they would have us believe, and arranges its material in artistic form. History, it is true, follows only certain

² The author has borrowed this thought from Sheran, "Handbook of Literary Criticism," ch. xxxii.

³ Noah Porter, "Books and Reading," p. 139.

⁴ *Id.*, *op. c.*, p. 140.

regularities in the circumstances of events and in the activities of human nature, and after a series of scientific researches has been duly conducted proceeds to collect the authenticated facts into one artistic whole. However, it must be borne in mind that the claims of historical inquiry are not satisfied by the historian who merely notes an event and reduces it to results of obviously favorable or antagonistic influences. It is part of his duty as scientist to study and interpret an event in its innermost relation to others connected with it and in its dependence on the general laws of physical and psychic nature. Every important personage, every event of moment must be examined as to what it has in common with the general drift of development and as to what it presents of individuality which would point to a departure from the general progress.

This feature differentiates history from the natural sciences. The latter invariably work according to general and uniformly operating laws, whereas the former regards the particular as well as the general. Hence it can never be reduced to the effects of mere mechanical forces. In like manner politics as a science has nothing in common with history. It draws its subject-matter from the various forms of government, investigates their nature, examines their effects on society and studies their relations to other existing forms of government. History, on the other hand, is concerned with society in so far as the latter is affected by the progress of civilization, by the circumstances and causes which were instrumental in the formation and downfall of States. Scientific analysis of general types of government *as such* is foreign to the domain of history. By a strange mixture of inharmonious ideas history has at times been identified with sociology. This study inquires into the conditions, the foundations and the changes of communities in order to ascertain and formulate rules for the successful construction of society; history notes the *achievements* of society. While, then, it is true that history may profit by the achievements of the arts and of the sciences or bear some resemblance to them as to form, it cannot be gainsaid that it is distinctly a science of its own. Thus the massiveness and complexity and unity of design in architecture fitly represent the artistic form of history. Like painting, it presents a variety of gorgeous scenes from battlefield and forum to palace and cathedral. Like the drama it portrays living characters moving amid real scenes, surrounded by real dangers and temptations. *History, then, is a science setting forth in artistic form the results of learned inquiry for the instruction, interest and improvement of mankind.* Instruction being the primary function of history, it follows that a study of history, when conducted along critical lines, will not fail of enriching the mind with a store of positive and reliable

ble information.⁵ In the words of Alzog, it is "the record of the systematic training and improvement of mankind by divinely appointed means as a preparation for the coming of Christ, that God might, through the coming of His Son, secure from man a spontaneous homage and a worship worthy of Himself."⁶ Forsooth, in presenting to us the records and experience of millions, the motives and consequences of their actions, history proves an unfailing source of invaluable instruction. It points out the road that leads to success and the byways whose goal is destruction. It enables us to acquire with comparative ease knowledge which others have gained only after bitter experiences. As we travel in spirit over many lands and our minds are carried back to the distant past, we note the customs of diverse nations, their civilization, their manners of worship, their commerce, their cultivation of the liberal arts, and by so doing we gather wisdom for our own conduct, finding in the past the key of many problems which perplex the present generation. This supposes, of course, that facts are not suppressed or distorted by prejudice, but presented in their true colors. If historians would, like Milman in his "History of Christianity," freely indulge in misrepresentations, or, like Garner and Lodge, to put the case mildly, make light of things and persons Catholic,⁷ the reader could hardly be expected to derive honest profit from the study of history. A more dangerous because more subtle form of error are false theories such as Hegel and Bancroft weave into their histories.

The study of history, furthermore, at once stimulates and satisfies the innate craving of man to become acquainted with the achievements, the struggles and reverses of the human family. History as no other science appeals to the broader sympathies of every educated and intelligent person whose interest in the course of human events is not bounded by the narrow limits of provincial or insular pursuits. It arouses attention to general affairs as opposed to those of local interest. It aids man in forming a truer conception of human brotherhood, coupled with a fair appreciation of the efforts made by the nations of the earth to promote culture, science, literature and the arts.

Respecting the relative importance of the various branches of learning as formative factors we make bold to affirm that history is second to none. A thorough and scientific study of history tends to foster culture by reducing prejudice. We are led to observe and compare the nations in all the departments of the institutional life.⁸

⁵ We refer to the *general* reliability of history.

⁶ Alzog's "Universal Church History," Introduction.

⁷ This criticism is directed against the "glaring errors" which marred the first edition of the "History of the United States."

⁸ By institutional life is meant the fivefold life of a nation. This com-

We note their progress in education, in the forms of government, in industry, in moral excellence. We discover in their wars and strifes the workings of the human passions, analyze their influence upon the world's culture and trace in the march of mankind through the ages the dispensations of Providence. Like the traveler who from a lofty eminence surveys a picturesque scene in which part corresponds to part, valley, river and meadow blending into one harmonious landscape, so we are elevated above the ordinary impediments to our mental vision, our intellectual horizon is widened and we discern points of view which before failed to attract our attention. At a glance we see the solution of certain problems which were well nigh insoluble to generations of bygone days, while, on the other hand, an intelligent reader of history will not be slow to realize that some historical phenomena must ever remain enigmas as long as man "sees but darkly as through a glass." "History," to use the words of a profound scholar, "constitutes the apparently easy and first elements of all instruction, and yet the more cultivated the mind of a man becomes the more multiplied opportunities will he find of applying it and turning it to use, the more will he discern its richness and divine its deeper sense."⁹

Yet here, as in every other form of reading, concentration of the mind upon what is being read and careful discrimination are the conditions necessary to ensure the beneficial results of which we speak. The desultory reader who has a smattering of superficial knowledge picked up here and there is, as a rule, unequal to the task of so fixing his attention as to put into requisition all the faculties of his intellect. And how can it be otherwise? His mind has not been disciplined into serious and sustained reflection on any one subject. He reads merely what for the moment dazzles his fancy and appeals to his unformed, uncritical and perverted taste. The position of a mind which has rarely if ever exercised the critical faculty in historical studies is analogous to that of a child who marvels at the multiplicity of shapes and colors presented on the wrong side of a piece of tapestry. The multitude of events which pour in upon the mind are to the desultory reader little beyond isolated and meaningless facts.¹⁰ To him the stream of human events presents no more than an upper current; for him the study of

prises the political, the social, the industrial, the educational, the religious phases of national life. For a comprehensive treatment of this subject, cf. Mace, "Method in History." For a brief and lucid exposition of the meaning, the origin, the value and the organic unity of the institutional life, the reader is referred to Sheran, "Handbook of Criticism," ch. xxxi., p. 228 ff.

⁹ Frederick v. Schlegel, "Philosophy of History."

¹⁰ Cardinal Newman, "Idea of a University," University Subjects, No. IX., p. 495.

history is a mere surface view; to him the course of actual events as affected by the laws of nature, by the passions of the human heart and by the several agencies whether favorable or adverse on which the issue of every momentous movement depended—in a word, the general results and interdependence of all the past transactions of the human race,¹¹ are a mass of discordant elements “without actual connection, without order or principle, without drift or meaning.”¹²

It would, then, be an unpardonable error of judgment to measure the extent of one's knowledge of history by the multitude of histories devoured. To suppose, furthermore, that a mere smattering of historical data will yield the gratifying results which accrue from a critical study of history were equally false and illusory. On the other hand, we are far from contending that the reader of history is required to learn by rote a detailed table of events. The first and lowest step to be taken in the acquisition of sound historical knowledge is the ascertaining of true facts. Unfounded myths are to be relegated to the domain of the fabulous, exaggerated accounts to be corrected, doubtful happenings to be investigated—in short, a precise knowledge of facts and dates is an indispensable requisite, without which there can be no thought of entering further into the study of history. Moreover, our ideas of commerce and civilization call for an emphatic treatment of the facts of history that have gone to build up trade and education. The modern historian must write the life of the schoolmaster, the artisan, the poet and the saint—in a word, of the men whose influence has shaped the religious, the intellectual and the social life of the nations. The battlefield may still hold a conspicuous place in the diorama of history, but equally prominent will be the workshop and the school. Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon will still figure prominently, but their fame as conquerors will be measured by their achievements in behalf of human *progress*. More than this, modern historians are not content to entertain their readers with stirring narratives of hotly contested claims of rival princes, of hard won triumphs, of romantic tournaments and religious revolutions. Time was when the “pomp of victory and the splendor of pageants”¹³ made up perhaps the greatest portion of historical works. All this has been changed. With the progress of criticism the spirit of the chronicler has been superseded by a more rigorous method of treatment as well as of research. The scientific historian nowadays feels himself constrained to ransack libraries, consult state papers and penetrate into the cabinets of minister and King, yea, into the very heart of man, there to search for the causes

¹¹ Schlegel, *op. c.*, p. 65.

¹² Cardinal Newman, *op. c.*, *ibid.*

¹³ Noah Porter, *op. c.*, ch. xii., p. 145.

of personal and national acts. May we hope that this welcome change in the department of historical composition will elicit in the reader a like critical spirit, or will history continue to be for him "a mere story book, or biography a romance?"¹⁴

The student of history must not suppose, however, that a correct interpretation of events is a matter that admits of being readily put out of hand with success, for "the circumstances which have most influenced the happiness of mankind, the changes of manners and morals, the transition of communities from poverty to wealth, from knowledge to ignorance, from ferocity to humanity—these are for the most part noiseless revolutions."¹⁵ There are, moreover, three agencies—the freedom of man, the power for evil permitted to Satan, the workings of Providence—which play a prominent part in shaping the course of history. There have not been wanting historians who affected to ignore these agencies. Having no sound first principles of knowledge to guide their efforts and unschooled in the laws and exercise of relentless logic, they have lost themselves in the mazes of theories and hypotheses as absurd as they are extravagant. There are on record historical phenomena of various kinds, the full significance and solution of which is an unknown quantity to the historian who refuses to recognize the freedom of will, the mystery of evil and the dispensations of Providence. Still we can account for many phenomena on purely natural grounds. Among these we place in the first rank the subtle and complex passions of the human heart. It requires no lavish expenditure of mental energy to become convinced of the fact that the horrors of the savage persecution to which the Catholic contingent of the English nation was subjected for centuries had their rise in the guilty passion of Henry VIII. for Anne Boleyn. Again, it were folly to deny that the religious upheaval in the sixteenth century sprang from the pride and obstinacy of a conceited monk. Century after century furnishes us with examples of prominent men whose ambition, avarice, pride or lust plunged whole nations into wars and misery.

Further important factors not to be overlooked in determining the causes of historic events are the accidents of time, place and environment. It is a fact too well known to need rehearsal that England owes her greatness, next of all, to her rock-bound coast and her singularly advantageous position, and, in the second place, to the opening out of her extensive coal and iron mines. Had the English Channel been narrower and England's coast less defiant, the historians of Albion would in all likelihood have a different tale to tell of Dutch fleets, French expeditions, and Spanish Armadas. Had

¹⁴ Cardinal Newman, *op. c.*, *ibid.*, p. 502.

¹⁵ Macaulay, "Essays—History."

England's coal and iron fields been less extensive, she could not have controlled European trade, she would not now be mistress of the seas. Take our own country. Who will not grant that our isolated and impregnable position was our strongest ally in the War of Liberation?

Closely akin to the study of causes is that of consequences. Thus an observant and critical reader of history will not fail to trace the consequences of the Protestant Reformation down to our times. The reformers stood for private interpretation and, by implication, denied authority. As a consequence whole nations became infected with a hatred of obedience and a spirit of insubordination. Revolution after revolution devastated the countries of Europe. In England the civil war created internal dissension and sent King Charles to the block; in France the monstrous revolution deluged the country in blood, robbed the nation of its legitimate sovereign and conjured up years of unrest and strife. Italy fared no better in the last century, whilst society in general experiences to our day the dire results of liberalism in the alarming indifference to all belief and in the threatening social unrest. Again, what would have been the fate of Europe had not Charles Martel defeated the Saracens, had Lepanto been lost to the Christians or had Napoleon delayed his march into Russia? History would probably read differently.

In the career of Napoleon—to cite one instance among many—we remark the operation of another agency, the intervention of an unseen yet powerful hand. In the successes and reverses of this mighty man the finger of God is clearly discernible. If truly observant in this and other phases of history, the reader cannot fail to note the dispensations of a Power "that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will." Given a vigorous exercise of the critical faculty, the intelligent reader must admit with Noah Porter that "The same criticism which has proved so destructive to the myths of Grecian and the legends of Roman story, has proved itself most positive and constructive when applied to the miraculous and supernatural which are alone adequate to explain the rise and development of the Mosaic and Christian economies."¹⁶ Nor is this strange. When we survey the course of history we shall find it to present certain groups of historical phenomena which invariably urge upon candid minds the conviction that the administration of Providence is at once a logical necessity and an historic reality. The experience of mankind has ever shown that all nations which abandoned their belief in the Divine either courted certain destruction or drew down upon themselves the just judgments of God. Is it not a remarkable fact that when nations grow haughty and surrender themselves to

¹⁶ Noah Porter, *op. c.*, ch. xi., p. 134.

the excesses of unrestraint they sooner or later suffer a reverse? The Greeks perished as a nation when the Divine became for them an object of derision. The story of Israel is likewise an instance in point. "Was it not a wanton roving after things forbidden, a curiosity to know what it was to be as the heathen [that was] one chief source of the idolatries of the Jews?"¹⁷ Had not the prophets lamented the waywardness of their people who, from a headstrong and infatuate craving for a novel worship, had left the God of their fathers? But Israel paid dearly for its stubbornness and hardness of heart when the rod of Roman dominion lay heavily on its shoulders. The Roman Empire, in its turn, began to totter when, with supreme contempt, the debauched and conceited Romans repudiated whatever savored of religion and worship. Hence its inability to withstand the inroads of barbarian hordes and the readiness with which it fell an easy victim to the warlike and believing nations of the north. Again, many a nation now groaning under the lash of oppression and pauperism, rent with internal dissension and stripped of the unity of faith is only a shadow of its former self.

Then, too, the very idea of retributive justice, such as it has been among the various nations of the earth, and the desire to propitiate an offended deity after the commission of crime, testify to the ruling of a Supreme Being over the affairs of men. Moreover, does it not seem strange that barbarian hordes should leave their Asiatic homes and travel irresistibly westward, finding no rest until, like a mad hurricane, they bore down upon the decaying empire of the Cæsars? Would it not appear that they had come to wash away in blood the corruption and outrages of a depraved heathen world? Why should they come just at the time when the enervated Roman stock, though elevated and purified by Christianity, sorely stood in need of an invigorating constituent to make it the foundation of future Christian nations?

Divine justice, it is true, may not in each instance visibly overtake the originators of political crimes, of national disorders, of religious upheavals. Henry VIII., Luther and some of the encyclopedists may not have been laid low by the thunderbolts of heaven, but in every case the nations sooner or later suffer for their transgressions. The Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan has written a thoughtful paper on "National Decay and Romanism," in which he contends, among other things, that England is in no small measure indebted for her national prosperity to her Catholic forefathers. After demonstrating this proposition he advances a statement which is to our purpose. "We are sorrowfully bound to confess," he writes,

¹⁷ John Henry Newman, "Parochial and Plain Sermons," Vol. VIII., Sermon V., p. 64.

"that the superficial pomp and splendor, and wealth and luxury, and outward show, of which so many boast, are more than counterbalanced by the appallingly irreligious, immoral and vicious state of multitudes of its inhabitants and the misery, squalor, wretchedness and degradation of enormous masses of her people."¹⁸ What are the reasons of this deplorable condition? Seeing that punishment is the natural sequel of guilt, must we not look for the prime causes of the present national ills of England in the turning away of that country from the faith of its fathers? France, too, paid dearly for her acceptance of blasphemous doctrines. It brought on her all the horrors of the Reign of Terror. Yet even then God's Providence raised up Napoleon, who was to crush the monster of anarchy and lawlessness, but who in his turn, after waxing insolent in the flush of victory, had to acknowledge the power and inviolability of her who is the centre and life of history, the Catholic Church.

This latter fact goes to show the importance of considering another agency necessary to a just interpretation and estimate of history. No reader who pauses to reflect can honestly set at naught the claims of Christianity. He will allow with Schlegel that "without this faith the whole history of the world would be naught else than an insoluble enigma—an inextricable labyrinth, a huge pile of the blocks and fragments of an unfinished edifice—and the great tragedy of humanity would remain devoid of all proper result."¹⁹ Christianity is the centre and pivot of the human record. From the earliest dawn of history all the lines of human endeavor converged to Christ the Redeemer and to His Church. But man proved false to God, meriting by his apostasy the terrors of Divine wrath. Such was the depth of irreligion and consequent moral degeneracy to which he sank that, while at the height of culture and learning, the world had to own in the person of Socrates that "unless some one came to put aside the thick mist, man could not know how he was to comport himself toward God and man." Hand in hand with this negative preparation for the coming of Christ God Himself kept alive the faith anciently vouchsafed to man by renewing the promise of a Redeemer and by leading His chosen people into heathen lands. We go further and say that He designedly centralized the whole world under Rome's dominion in order to facilitate the diffusion of the Gospel and the expansion of His kingdom on earth.

And when the God-Man finally appeared to sanctify this sinful earth by lifting the curse which for ages had rested on the sons of men, He became at once the Redeemer of mankind and the centre of the world's history. After a holy life, spent partly in obscurity,

¹⁸ Rev. Sasia, S. J., "Christian Apologetics," p. 698.

¹⁹ "Philosophy of History," Lecture X., p. 279.

partly in public ministration, He was condemned to death and crucified, restoring by His passion and death the order which sin had inverted. Then having proved His divinity by the most stupendous of all miracles, the Resurrection, He entrusted His mission to the Church, through which He sanctified and elevated the human race. Gently has the Church insinuated her doctrines into the minds of men, inaugurated reforms, leavened society and by patient firmness renewed the face of the earth, all the while rising to a height of magnificence and glory that struck men's minds with amazement. True, waves of barbarian devastation hurled themselves upon the eternal rock, heresy threatened disruption, Greek schism and Turkish invasion wrought untold havoc upon the Church, royal oppression and outbreaks of popular fury checked the free display of her activities, but the Ship of Christ weathered the storm bravely, preserving to us the priceless blessings of faith and civilization. Luther affected to reform her, atheists sought to undermine her, princes and rulers opposed her, secret societies use every endeavor to compass her ruin. But all to no effect, and *never* with impunity! Full many a time the bark of Peter has ploughed through billows of blood and breasted the waves of human passion, but never yet has her Divine Pilot failed to hush the winds and bid the waves retreat. Forsooth, "She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot on Britain, before the Franks had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, when idols were still worshiped at Mecca, and she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul."²⁰

To sum up, the study of history as a prolific source of useful information consists not in omnivorous and desultory reading, but in a careful and intelligent perusal, with due attention to the coherence of events, to their causes and consequences, to their relation with religion, and, above all, with the religion of Christ. If pursued along these lines, the study of history will reveal a hidden store of knowledge and will become a source of permanent larning and delight. From the pages of history we can learn the unity of the human race and the story of its continuous development. It teaches that every individual member of the human family may be a link in the mighty chain of progress; that man's is a life well worth living; that a sublime aim is to govern his efforts, and that, if he be true to his destiny, he must strive nobly and well. History, moreover, furnishes the key of many problems of practical life. More than this, it is a potent factor in leveling prejudice by leading us to value the achievements of others. We are constrained to deprecate the bigoted and

²⁰ Macaulay, "Review of Ranke's History of the Popes."

misleading lucubrations of historians and to reject, if not to confound, the manifold errors propagated in the press and through the many-mouthed organs of public opinion. We frankly acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe to such eminent critics as Cardinal Newman and Spedalieri for the signal services they have rendered to Catholic truth by their masterful refutations of the insidious "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;" to Balmes for his critical examination of Guizot's "History of Civilization;" to Archbishop Spalding for his scathing criticisms of Prescott and Bancroft. And if well informed and scholarly laymen like Dr. Walsh, who silenced the slanderous charge of a professor in a well-known Eastern university, meet the attacks of unscientific historians, we heartily endorse their action. For truth is sacred. And such as are of the truth will not commit the effrontery to wantonly urge the unfounded charge against the Catholic Church that she ever minimized or discountenanced the claims of true science. The impulse given to modern historical research by Leo XIII. is a matter of recent knowledge. The encouraging words spoken by the scholarly Pontiff are not likely soon to be forgotten. "Continue to work with courage and perseverance, zealously and cheerfully, not so much in order to obtain earthly reward or human praise, but above all do this work for the love of God and for His honor, for He will requite your endeavors with heavenly and everlasting reward." Such is the message which the Church in the person of the Divinely appointed custodian of natural and revealed truth delivers to honest and reputable scholars.

ANTHONY BECK.

Prairie du Chien, Wis.

ON THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES.

II.

CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS SUCCESSORS.

MR. DUCHESNE traces the gradations in the acquirement of temporal sovereignty by the Popes, showing how their moral influence all along, especially as the Empire in Italy became more and more inefficient, had been such as to give them the command over the Roman people even in civil concerns. The Roman Bishop was like no other Bishop as regards his control over men, and this fact was declared in the ordinal for the consecration of a Pope, where he is styled Apostolical Lord, Vicar of St. Peter, High Priest of the Roman Sanctuaries, Primate of the Bishops in the whole world, Universal Doctor. "Such a Bishop," remarks Mgr. Duchesne, "could not have been subject to the Duke of the Roman Duchy, as the Bishops of Venice and Naples were subject to their Dukes." The idea is borne out by the address of St. Leo I. to Rome: "Saints Peter and Paul have raised thee to this glory that thou art a holy nation, an elect people, a city at once priestly and kingly, with a presidency wider by divine religion than by earthly domination!"

As for the Lombards, the rivals and possible enemies of the Papacy, their Princes gradually became Catholic and showed themselves amenable to the Pope's will when their conquests put it in their power to be recalcitrant. Mgr. Duchesne thinks that what greatly stood in the way of their being chosen, instead of the Franks, protectors of the Holy See was their near neighborhood, which would make them more interfering, but especially their barbarous manners and repulsive features, which were bars to equality of intercourse. Their Kings, Luitprand, Rachis and Didier, were religious men. Astolpus, on the contrary, was aggressive, and it was against his encroachments that Stephen II. invoked the aid of Pepin, who with his Franks lent assistance rather out of reverence for St. Peter than out of any desire to supplant the Byzantine Emperors in their hereditary lordship over Italy. When the iconoclast, Leo the Isaurian, persecuted the Popes instead of defending them, not only the weakness, but also the violence of Constantinople became urgent reasons for throwing off the allegiance to it and seeking a better over-lord. So it was to Charlemagne that Hadrian I. appealed against the Lombards, whose King the Franks thereupon conquered and deposed. The next summons to Charlemagne for

protection was made because of an internal revolution at Rome, which the Pope was not physically strong enough to hold under control, with the consequence that his own life was in danger. The result of the application was that the Pope received confirmation of his sovereignty over his temporal States, and in return Leo III. crowned Charles Emperor of the West, with the special duty to be the secular arm of the Church. The new title of Emperor was much more significant than the previous one of Patrician, and later ages tried, by recourse to Roman law, to stretch to the very utmost the power of the revived imperialism over the Popes. It was the battle between Sacerdotium and Imperium as two universal powers. Herodian had written: "Where the Emperor is, there is Rome." A Christian Father wrote: "Where Peter is, there is the Church."¹ Eginhard says that the coronation came to Charlemagne as a surprise. How much of prearrangement there was about the whole matter is left in dispute. It is certain that no exact theory of the situation was elaborated from the first. It was in later times that the extreme imperialists, strong in Roman law, held that Charlemagne was Emperor by conquest, with all the powers of the Augustan line, while the Papal party, on the other hand, said that the Christian empire was an institution of the Pope, who made it what primarily it was—namely, his instrument for the service of the Church—and yet further a third theory was in the field, that of patriotic Romans, who held that they as heirs to the capital city were the inheritors of the old rights. A curious setting aside of the several pretensions is made by M. Laurent in his book, "La Papauté et L'Empire," a work which forms part of the series "Histoire des Droits des Gens et des Relations Internationals." As an evolutionist he thinks that he sees in the contest a necessary step towards the production in Europe of free countries and free peoples through two powers which were both tyrannies. The Papacy, he allows, did the supreme service of moralizing the barbarians and educating Europe for freedom, while the empire acted as a needful check on the Papal aspirations to be simply dominant. We have come thus, thinks the theorist, to independent nationalities, with liberty for their component individuals, the price of this boon having been a time of subjection to two universal dominations, neither of which were in themselves admissible on the true principles of human freedom. Such is M. Laurent's view. We may leave alone the abstract precision of theories to see how in practice the power of the Emperor in relation to the Pope began to work on the general but not narrowly and jealously defined principle of friendly coöperation. We may find the materials for a judgment in Migné's "Latin

¹ St. Ambrose Migne, t. 14, col 1,082.

Fathers," tome 98, which shows a very different spirit from that which arose not long afterwards, when the investiture controversy waxed hot and competition supplanted coöperation. Mgr. Duchesne dwells rather one-sidedly on the admonitory and almost pedagogic tone in which Charlemagne wrote to Leo III. concerning the conduct which the Pope should pursue to prevent a future outbreak among his subjects. The accusations against Leo III. had been very grave indeed. Alcuin says they went as far as charges of gross immorality, but in those days it was usual to let the urgency of the desire to destroy a character settle the gravity of the allegations. When Charlemagne arrived at Rome to quell the faction he could not as judge summon the Pope to his tribunal, but the Pontiff undertook to expurgate himself on oath from the crimes alleged, and with this policy we may compare the act of Pope Damasus, who had, when pressed by the Anti-Pope's party, submitted his case to the Emperors.² We shall never understand the position of Leo III. and subsequent positions unless we bear clearly in mind that Rome in the Middle Ages was one of the turbulent Italian cities, and not the least turbulent. Constantly the people got quite out of hand as regards the Pontiff who tried to hold the reins, and he had to throw them down and take to flight. No single governing power over Italy ever succeeded to the Augustan Empire; nothing more than an Augustus could have any permanence, and at intervals a strong man brought a strong hand to bear on the peninsula. There was in name, from the time of the Lombard invasion, a King of Italy, but he meant very little. He was either the Emperor or a vassal of his, at least titularly. The southern part of the peninsula was broken off from the rest, being under the dominion of Greeks, or Saracens, or Angevins, or Aragonese. A number of free cities lapsing into petty tyrannies, along with a few larger States, kept up a perpetual warfare, in which foreign mercenaries were largely hired, and the Popes had to live as they could, while to this sad condition of things was added the further misfortune that on several occasions they were elected by a faction irrespective of qualities fitting them for their sacred post.³ Popes and Emperors had a very fluctuating control over their nominal charges and they weakened each other by mutual disagreements.

If we look now to the correspondence that passed between Leo

² Similarly Pascal I. swore to his innocence before the plenipotentiaries of the Emperor Louis when these were sent to investigate a charge of murder at Rome.

³ The irregularities following on the ill-treatment of the corpse of Pope Formosus led to the condition that the Papal election should take place, *preventibus legatis imperatoris*. Lambert was then emperor; Otho I. later acquired the right to approve a Papal election before the elect was consecrated.

and Charlemagne, we find that the former remonstrates on occasion thus: "Your Serene Highness despatched to us imperial missi for the execution of justice, but it is harm rather than they are doing." All the same the Pope does not repent of having assigned to Charles his office: "We beseech your imperial clemency so to treat the donation which you received from God to give it over to the Apostle Peter, that it may in no manner suffer diminution, but by your strenuous exertions may ever abide in security."⁴ Again the Pope has to write about the imperial missi in Rome, adding trustfully: "After all we commend everything to your most wise decision."⁵ If we look next to the letters of Charlemagne in reply, we find a good disposition to do his duty to the Church. We must not be surprised at or take too technically language which in the time of later quarrels would have signified a usurped authority. For instance, Charlemagne writes: "*Praelectis Excellentiae vestrae litteris valde gavisi sumus . . . in humilitatis vestrae obedientiae et promissionis ad nos fidelitate.*"⁶ This is the language of a strong Prince who had given—but not simply given where there was no other title—domains to a Pope, and had rescued him from rebellious subjects afterwards, and now was speaking not as a trained theologian, nor yet as a polite gentleman most careful to use language with no possible offensiveness in its terms. It is the speech from a plain-tongued conqueror of domains imperially wide, who was obviously the greatest potentate of his age⁷ and accustomed to wield authority. It is true that not everywhere in the books called Caroline, when they magnify ecclesiastical power, is the voice that of Charlemagne; nor, on the other hand, are the words which were uttered in the Council of Frankfort held in 794, six years before he was made Emperor, proved to be personally his utterances. For example, these: "*Cujus ecclesiae, quoniam in sinu regni, gubernacula Domino tribuente suscepimus.*" It is pure conjecture to suppose here some pique at not having been consulted about the second Council of Nicea, which gave decisions on the cultus of images that were not pleasing to the Westerns.

As to the capitularies of Charles, which embody much real history, we find therein how Church and State worked together by joining their two distinct but not uncombinable authorities for the good of the Christian peoples. National assemblies and ecclesiastical synods

⁴ Migne, tom. 98, col. 522.

⁵ Col. 526.

⁶ Col. 907.

⁷ The friendly offices of Charlemagne may be compared to those of Valentinian and Gratian towards Pope Damasus, who submitted to their judgment the case against the anti-Pope, because he had not himself the temporal power to control the insurgents, but his spiritual jurisdiction he most firmly asserted all the while.

legislated in concert, and some members belonged to both bodies. The nation took up a number of the synodal decrees, making the enactments its own. The Capitularies⁸ forbid clerics to bear arms and to fight. In accordance to arrangements made after consultation with the Pope, the manner is laid down after which accused clerics are to expurgate themselves or receive penalty for offenses.

Charlemagne did as England gradually came to do after the throne had been humiliated by the reverence paid to St. Thomas of Canterbury—he put clerical offenses, even the criminal cases, under episcopal jurisdiction.⁹ The Justinian law for the greater crimes was degradation from clerical rank and then judgment by the lay tribunal: “*Spoliari sacerdotali dignitate et ita sub legum fieri manu.*”¹⁰ The Capitularies thus continued their regulations; the imperial *missi* might examine into the conduct of clerical officials;¹¹ priests must qualify for ordination by a previous examination;¹² those summoned to appear before the imperial commission must obey the mandate—*ut episcopi et potentiores quicumque ad nostram jubeantur venire praesentiam.*¹³ More than once it is noted that the Pope had been consulted upon the matter decreed, and we must further observe that the decrees just mentioned affected not Rome, but various other dioceses in the Empire.

Mgr. Duchesne lays much stress on the Constitution of Lothaire, whom his father, the Emperor Louis the Pious, sent to Rome for the purpose of quieting a disturbed state of affairs. It seems to us that too much is attributed by our author to the authority displayed in the document, which is to be found in Harduin, c. iv., 1261-1262. Persons under Papal and imperial protection are to be held inviolable: “*Et hoc decernimus ut domino apostolico in omnibus justa servetur obedientia.*” Those Romans only whose right is established by ancient custom are to be the electors when a new Pope is to be chosen;¹⁴ *missi* are to be appointed by Pope and Emperor to give to each of these sovereigns a yearly account as to how officials have discharged their functions; complaints are to be laid first before the Pope, who may refer the cases to the Emperor; the inhabitants must name the law¹⁵ under which they are going to live, and accord-

⁸ Harduin, IV., 943.

⁹ Capit., c. 28, anno 789; c. 39, anno 803.

¹⁰ Novell. Pref., Sect. 2.

¹¹ The Northern invaders were wise enough to see that the Roman law was a better code than their own customaries, and therefore they left a choice of systems to their subjects. In the present case Romans may have escaped penal law by escaping Roman law by recourse to Lombard and to Salic law.

¹² P. 953.

¹³ P. 954.

¹⁴ P. 956.

¹⁵ This may have helped the lay party in Rome to recover their votes.

ing to the code of their choice Pope and Emperor will see that they are judged; while the Emperor is at Rome, in order that he may have the opportunity to become acquainted with the men responsible in various departments, these must come into his presence and receive instruction. Everywhere in the document we find the Pope named before the Emperor, and if we grant the necessity of the imperial control, its office is not too much magnified. Then there is the concluding decree, which is wholly favorable to the Pope: "*Novissime precipimus et monemus ut omnis homo, sicut Dei gratiam et nostram habere desiderat, ita praestet in omnibus obedientiam atque reverentiam Romano Pontifici.*" The reigning Pontiff was Eugenius II.

A further indication how Charlemagne did not assume that he had won for himself and still retained the rulership over the Roman States is sought in the terms of the division which he made of his realm among his three sons. After assigning to them their three portions respectively, which did not include the Papal territories, he adds with regard to the Pope that all should jointly act as his defenders: "*Super omnia autem jubemus ut ipsi tres fratres curam ac defensionem ecclesiae Sancti Petri simul suscipiant, sicut quondam ab avo nostro Carolo et beatae memoriae genitore nostro Pippino rege, et a nobis postea suscepta est.*"¹⁶ Charles never forgot that the Popes, besides the claim due on the score of the donations made by himself and Pepin, had a title in the choice of the peoples over whom they ruled and who had been free to choose after the failures of the Byzantine Emperors. Also there was a title, if not a complete one, in the Papacy itself and in the necessities of its condition during the early formation of Christendom, when clerics were almost the only educated and competent administrators. Some will here recall Newman's description of the Pope's claim, inasmuch as the Pontiff was "heir by default" to Rome.

It is urged that before the coronation by the Popes, which came later, Charlemagne appointed Louis Emperor and Louis appointed Lothaire. As to these facts Hergenröther favors the inference that Papal agreement had previously been attained.

In any case there is no proof that the force of the original derivation of the title from the Pope was thereby nullified or set at defiance in order to assert a right by conquest. As to the Emperor's share in the making of a new Pope, he was first content with a notice sent to him what election had been made; later he claimed a more positive power of approval, and there was some reason for this when the elections became less pure in their proceedings. From the Byzantine Emperor the last Pope to ask confirmation had been Zachary.

¹⁶ Harduin, IV., 446.

Lothaire's Constitution limited the electors to Romans having a prescriptive right; the rules were afterwards variously modified, and unfortunately rules sometimes were set at defiance in the strifes of the ambitious of the factious.¹⁷ The Empire which started with Charlemagne did not fulfill its early promise, for though his grandson, Charles the Fat, reunited under his rule the previously divided dominions, he proved unequal to his position, and with him the first line in the new empire came to an end, 800. Yet we must give the Carolingians credit for what they did or what was done under their favoring reign. "Under the early Frankish Kings the Church was the main source and principle of civilization—the dominant power of society. All important acts of legislation emanated from its councils. Its prelates were ministers of States; its priests were civil magistrates; justice was ordinarily dispensed through its tribunals. Church and State were so intimately blended as scarcely to be distinguishable. Feudalism brought the important change, turning Bishops, abbots and the higher dignitaries into territorial feudatories."¹⁸

This feudalism had much to do with secularizing the clergy; with filling its ranks from the needy sons of the barons and squires; with violating the canons that forbade the clergy to become soldiers on the battlefield,¹⁹ and with many other evils which spoilt the good which ought to have been derived from the union of the Church with the State, and from the large concessions made to the spiritual powers to have their decrees enforced by the magistrates and to judge cases in their own tribunals till the time should arrive the civil law should find a laity more fitted for its administration.²⁰ It is not needful to

¹⁷ Alexander Noel, de Marca and others denied that the Pope held his temporal estates independently; they asserted a joint tenure with the Emperor.

¹⁸ "The Church in France," by W. H. Jevons. When, in England, William of Wykeham and other clerical statesmen were deposed to make way for laymen, the last proved exceedingly corrupt and had to be prosecuted by the Good Parliament.

¹⁹ The eightieth of the apostolic canons said: "Ne quis episcopus, presbyter, aut diaconus militiae vacet." Under pressure of Norman invasion, St. Leo IX. appeared in arms; Julius II. was also ready to fight in the Crusades. One of the latest decrees on the subject is dated July 12, 1900: "Quisquis de clero ut bellis et politicis contentione opem utcumque ferat, propiae residentiae locum absque justa causa, quae a legitima ecclesiastica auctoritate recognita sit, deseruit et clericales vestes exuerit, quamvis arma non sumpserit, et humanum sanguinem minime fuderit; et eo magis qui in civili bello sponte sua militiae nomen dederit, aut bellicas actiones quocumque dirigere praesumerit, etsi ecclesiasticum habitum retinere perget, ab ordinum et graduum exercitio, et a quolibet ecclesiastico officio et beneficio suspensus ipso facto maneat."

²⁰ Some question has been raised about the decree in the Capitularies *apud Baluze Capit. Reg. Franc. Lit.*, VI., n. 366, p. 985: "Quicumque item habens, sive possessor sive petitor fuerit, si judicem elegerit legis antis-

follow Mgr. Duchesne into the sad history of the Papacy when family ambitions decided Papal elections and two bad women, Theodora and Merozia, were using their baleful influence. The Emperor Otho I. (936-973) brought the beginnings of better things, but was quite unable to become a second Charlemagne. A greater reform was started by Gregory VII. in conflict with the Emperor Henry IV. (1073-1080), who continued the struggle against Victor III., Urban II. and Paschal II. (1073-1106). Then Henry V. imprisoned Paschal II. and his Cardinals till they yielded investiture rights, which afterwards they could not conscientiously confirm. The compromise was the Concordat of Worms, 1122, when Calistus II. was Pope. There followed the Conflict of Frederick I. against Hadrian IV. and Alexander III. (1154-1180) and that of Frederick II. against Honorius III., Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. (1216-1250). Here in a substantial sense may be said to have ended the long duel between *Sacerdotium* and *Imperium*, with the defeat of the latter and with a severe wound left in the former.

J. RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

ONCE more the attention of the world is directed toward the East, and its eyes are fixed upon Constantinople. Although it was known that the party of "Young Turkey" had been at work for a long time, we could hardly expect such a complete, though peaceful revolution, and such a complete emancipation as we have witnessed in the last months. Newspapers and magazines have kept us busy with rumors of war in Turkey and the neighboring provinces, and it is hard to foresee what is in store for the Turkish Empire and, consequently, for the Mahomedan world.

I shall endeavor to give a bird's-eye view of the history of what was once the Empire of Byzantium, and thus lead up to the events of the present year.

The early history of Hellas, and of that more ancient people that

item, etiamsi altera pars refragatur, ad episcoporum judicium cum sermone litigantium dirigatur. Omnes itaque causa quae vel praetorio jure vel civili tractantur, episcoporum sententiis terminatae, perpetuo stabilitatis jure firmantur, nec licet alterius tractari judicium, quod episcoporum sententiae decidunt." Charlemagne also took up the old rule of Chalcedon (Mansi, VII., 981), that a civil law which contravened the canons should be invalid.

preceded it, the Pelasgi, is, like the history of most of other nations, buried in obscurity and entirely impenetrable except to the researches of the archaeologist and philologist. When the dawn begins to break it is obscured by the fables of mythology. The exploits of Hercules, the golden fleece and the voyage of the Argonauts, as well as the siege and downfall of Troy, belong to this fabulous age, though beneath it all, no doubt, underlies a substratum of truth. When, finally, the sun of Grecian history rises we find Hellas, with its three principal tribes of Æolians, Dorians and Ionians, split up into a number of small States, kingdoms or republics, with the Amphycithionic Council as their congress and band of unity. Sparta and Athens are the rising stars among the Grecian cities, but Hellas is of wider extent than the territory of Greece proper, for wherever Hellenes are found there is Hellas. Greeks or Hellenes inhabited the shores of Asia Minor, whence their brethren had crossed over to Europe, and they had colonized Sicily and southern Italy. Legislation, internal politics and feuds occupy the several States of Hellas until the beginning of the fifth century before Christ, when the great Persian wars begin. The three great Eastern empires of Chaldæa, Assyria and Babylonia had passed away, Nineveh had almost disappeared and Babylon was in a state of irreparable decay. Persia, with Cyrus at its head, was the ruling power of the Orient. Unlike the Turks, the mediæval enemies of the Hellenic race, the dwellers on the plains of ancient Oran, the Medes and Persians, belonged to the same great branch of the human family as the Greeks; they were Aryans. The representatives of autocracy in Asia and the lovers of freedom in Greece appear in collision in the reign of Darius I., who had succeeded Cambyses, son of Cyrus. Several of the Greek cities of Ionia in Asia Minor which had been subjugated by Cyrus had endeavored to throw off the Persian yoke, and the Athenians encouraged them in this revolt. Thus in 499 B. C. and in 1897 A. D.—that is, with an interval of 2,396 years—we find Athens sending forth an armed force to help its kinsfolk beyond the seas, and on each occasion a war is precipitated. In 1897 the Greek fleet and army intervened to help Crete against Turkey, and in 499 B. C. the Athenians sent twenty ships and a small force to aid the Ionian insurgents against the Persians. There was then, however, no European concert to check the designs of the Athenians, but they had the mighty Persian monarchy to encounter, and Darius determined to take vengeance on them for the burning of Sardis. Macedonia was invaded and subjugated, but the expedition could not push forward its successes, the fleet having failed to coöperate, owing to a fierce storm which shattered it off Mount Athens. Darius now sent heralds to demand the submission of the

Hellenic States. The cities on the islands generally made their submission, as did many of the continental States.

It was at this critical juncture, when Hellenic civilization was threatened by Eastern despotism, that two champions arose in Athens and Sparta. Their conjunction aroused the spirit of Hellas, and a defensive league was formed, in which most of the lesser States joined. The Persian army sent by Darius landed in the bay east of Attica, and on the immortal plains of Marathon it was encountered by the Greeks under Miltiades. How gloriously different the campaign of 490 B. C. from that of A. D. 1897! The Athenian army of 10,000, reëforced by 600 from Platæa, met a Persian army ten times its number, defeated it and saved Athens. How different from the battle of the Milouna Pass and the rout at Larissa.

Ten years passed, and Persia again invaded Greece. Xerxes had succeeded Darius, and Sparta now stood at the head of the Hellenic League. It is noteworthy that the Persian invasion of Greece under Xerxes covered nearly the same ground as that of the Turks in the campaign of 1897. The Asiatics advanced westward through Thrace and Macedonia, and then, turning southward, rushed through Thessaly upon Attica. Another analogy between the campaign of Xerxes, and that of Edhem Pasha we find in the fact that the Asiatic invasion was a complete success. In the ancient campaign, however, the tide was soon completely turned, and victory perched upon the banners of the Greeks. When the Persians came pouring into Greece the Greeks determined to take their stand at Thermopylæ. A small force of only 7,000 troops, under command of the Spartan King Leonidas, was sent to defend this mountain pass against the vast host of Xerxes. For two days they held the enemy at bay, until a traitor pointed out to the Persians a mountain pass by which they might turn the position of the Greeks. Most of the Greek officers now proposed retreat, but Leonidas, with his three hundred Spartans and seven hundred Thespians, resolved to die at their post. The rest of the allies were permitted to retire. The heroic band, advancing into the open space, were soon surrounded by the enemy, and they perished to a man, leaving an immortal memory to their country. Alas! 2,359 years later occurred the retreat from Larissa.

Athens, deserted by its population, was reduced to ashes by the Persians, but all was not lost for Greece. The naval victory of Salamis discouraged Xerxes, as much as it raised the spirits of the Greeks, and the Persian monarch retreated to his own dominions, leaving a force of 300,000 men, under Mardonius. The following year the victory of Platæa, gained by the Spartan leader Pausanias and the Athenian Aristides, routed the enemy, while the battle of

Mycale, in Asia Minor, destroyed the remnant of the Persian fleet. The battles of Salamis, Platæa and Mycale decided the war, and the Persians never again invaded Greece. Europe was thus saved from Oriental despotism, and this is one of the many debts it owes to little Greece.

The half century that now follows forms the most glorious period of Athenian history. It was the golden age of Pericles. But, alas! it was also in this age that the seeds were sown of that internecine strife that was to prepare the way for the downfall of Grecian freedom and for Macedonian supremacy. Pericles lived to behold the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, that great struggle between oligarchy and democracy, Athens heading the Ionian, or democratic, and Sparta the Dorian, or aristocratic party. Athens fell, and Sparta became the greatest power in Greece, to be succeeded by Thebes.

Philip of Macedon now enters into Grecian politics. Acknowledged a member of the Ampyctionic Council, his ambitions grew until at last he became master of Greece, and Hellenic liberties fell. Since that day the Grecian people have never entirely recovered their liberties. The spirit of ancient Hellas is broken. Under Alexander, the son and successor of Philip, Greece again met Asia, this time as the aggressor. The Persians were obliged to encounter their old enemies in the heart of their own kingdom. The Persian monarch, Darius Codomanus, was overthrown, Persia acknowledged the dominion of Alexander the Great, and the short-lived Macedonian Empire arose on the ruins of the great Persian monarchy. Though this mighty empire crumbled after the death of its founder, yet its results were lasting. Grecian culture imposed itself upon Asia, and Greek became the predominant language of the civilized world. Less than two centuries later, Greece was merged into the Roman Empire, after the downfall of which it was to pass into the power of the Turks.

The name of Turk first appears in history in the fifth century of our era, in the reign of the Emperor Justinian. We find the Turks the most despised portion of the slaves of the great Khan of the Geougen (Jouan-Jouan), working the iron forges of their masters on the slopes of the Altai Mountains. Under the leadership of Bertezena they vindicated their rights as a separate tribe, and, sallying forth from their mountain home, they began to wage war against the neighboring tribes. Proceeding from victory to victory, they established in Tartary the powerful empire of the Turks, which entered into relations of peace and war with the Romans on one side and with China on the other. This great empire lasted a period of two hundred years, and then vanished from history, leaving,

however, the Turks masters of the great Asiatic steppes. Supplying the Arab dynasty of the Samanis as well as the Saracen Khalifs with mercenary troops, they again slowly came forth into the light of history, and in the eleventh century, once more founded a great empire, that of Seljuk, which aided greatly to propagate the doctrines of the Prophet of Mecca, which Seljuk and his descendants had now embraced. First as slaves, then as a military aristocracy and, finally, as conquerors, the Seljukian Turks absorbed Persia and the whole empire of the Khalifs. Togrul, the grandson of Seljuk, and Alp-Arslan, the successor of Togrul, consolidated their empire and began to encroach upon that of the Romans. Under Malek Shah the frontiers of the empire were still further extended. Soliman added to his dominions a new kingdom, that of Roum, or of the Romans, which was formed from the dominions of the Byzantine empire in Anatolia, or Asia Minor, and Nice became the capital of the Sultan. Finally Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Seljukians. The yoke of the Fatinite Caliphs had weighed lightly on the Christians of Palestine, but that of the Northern Barbarians became galling. The cries of the persecuted Christians reached the ears of their brethren in the West, and the voice of Peter the Hermit stirred Europe to its very depths. The Council of Clermont followed, and the Christian nations of the West poured forth their thousands for the relief of the Holy Land. The Crusades saved the West from the Seljukian Turks, and gave to their empire a blow from which it never recovered.

In the middle of the eleventh century of our era, the Turks of the dynasty of Seljuk first appear in collision with the Byzantine empire. Under the leadership of Togrul, the grandson of Seljuk, the Turkish horse overspread the Greek frontier of over six hundred miles, and the blood of one hundred and thirty thousand Christians was poured out without any lasting result for the invader, whose arms were met by the bravery of the Romans, as the Greeks of the lower empire loved to style themselves. Alp Arslan, the successor of Togrul, was more successful, and Armenia and Georgia were wrested from the Byzantine empire. The brave Emperor, Romanus Diogenes, fought with courage, but the resources at his command were insufficient, and the heroic Emperor, a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, was forced to subscribe to the exorbitant demands of his conqueror. The Seljukian Sultan dictated then to Romanus Diogenes, as the Ottoman Sultan a few years ago dictated to Greece. A ransom of a million, and an annual tribute of three hundred and sixty thousand pieces of gold were demanded.

The Asiatic provinces of the Greek empire gradually fell into the hands of the Seljukian Turks and the Holy City of Jerusalem finally

became subject to them. It was this last event that aroused the Western nations and began that gigantic uprising which history has handed down to us as the Crusades, a movement which though it did not succeed in rescuing the East from Mahomedanism, at least saved Europe from the Seljukian Turks.

The Ottoman Turks first appear in history in the thirteenth century. In the last year of that century, the Caliph Othman invaded Greek territory. His son and successor, Orchan, subdued the province of Bithynia as far as the shores of the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. The Byzantine empire was now verging to its fall, which the intestine divisions of the Greeks themselves only served to precipitate.

The great Mongol invasion under Zingis Khan swept like a tidal wave over the East and over a part of Europe, and when it rolled back, death and desolation lay in its path. Still the Seljukian line survived. It was mid the excitement of this invasion, that the Ottoman Turks first came into notice. The Seljukian Sultan of Iconium being one day hard pressed by the Mongols, a small body of unknown horsemen reversed the fortune of the day, and the Seljuk gained the victory. The strangers had accidentally come upon the battle-field of Angora, and at once declared for the weaker side. Only 400 in number, they belonged to the Oghuz family of Truks, and Ertoghrul, son of Suleyman, was their leader. More than six centuries have passed since then, and the family of Ertoghrul still exists. Thirty-five Princes in the male line, without a break in the succession, separate Abdul Hamid, the present ruler of Turkey, from his ancestor Ertoghrul.

A small district was given to these new auxiliaries of the Seljukians, and there the foundations of the Ottoman empire were laid. Here, in 1258, was born Othman, the son of Ertoghrul, from whom the present Turkish race has taken its name. This territory lay in the old Seljukian kingdom of Roum, and when at the end of the thirteenth century the Seljukian dynasty became extinct, it was one of the ten States that arose upon the remnants of the Seljukian empire. Gradually the Ottomans gained by the sword the ascendancy over their rivals, and Othman bequeathed a growing empire to his son Orchan. The attacks on the Byzantine empire continued, and in a short time a considerable portion of Asia Minor was in the hands of the Turks. Before the middle of the fourteenth century they had crossed the Hellespont. Under Murad I., Orchan's son and successor, Macedonia and Thrace succumbed and Adrianople became the European capital of the Turks. Alas, the age of the Crusades was over and the Turks were permitted to gain that foothold in Europe which they have held to this time. The enemy sub-

dued the province of Thrace from the Hellespont to Mount Hæmus and Adrianople became their European capital. The empire of the Greeks dwindled away to the small strip of land on which Constantinople stood and the end was near. Bajazet, the Turkish Sultan, might indeed write to the Emperor Manuel that beyond the walls of Constantinople he had nothing left.

For a while the Turks felt that if they attempted to take Constantinople they might provoke a coalition of the Christian Powers of Europe, more formidable even than the Crusades. In view of recent events, I deem it useful to cast a glance at the action of those powers in the downfall of the Eastern empire. One factor must not be lost sight of in the relations between the East and the West—namely, the schism. The differences existing between the Latin and Greek Christians were far less important than those which divide Catholics from Protestants, yet they were vital. In point of doctrine the faith of the Greeks was, with the exception of a few points, identical with that of the Latins, yet these differences were essential. The doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost in the Blessed Trinity and that of the supremacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff opened a chasm which could not be bridged over, and Greeks and Latins looked upon each other with undisguised contempt. The Latin nations, centred around the Pope, were a unit, while the venerable patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria were in the power of the Mahometans. Constantinople alone held out, and, as Gibbon remarks, in its four last centuries its friendly or hostile attitude towards the Pope and the Latins may be observed as the thermometer of its prosperity or distress. When the Seljukian Turks threatened Constantinople, the Emperor Alexius implored the protection of the Pope, and the Crusades were the answer to his supplication. No sooner is the danger past than the Greeks throw off the mask and again exhibit their hatred of the Latins. Various fruitless negotiations between Greeks and Latins follow, the union effected at Lyons does not prove lasting and, finally, the Greek empire approaches its agony. John Paleologus goes to Rome in person; he enlists in his favor Urban V., but the age of the Crusades has passed, and, unlike the other Urban, whose appeal had stirred Europe to its inner depths, the Pope fails to move the Powers of Europe in defense of Constantinople. Thirty years later Manuel, his son and successor, made another appeal in person to the Christian powers. He traveled through Italy, France, England and Germany. He was everywhere received with the highest honors, but his efforts to obtain assistance came to naught. The time could not have been less propitious. It was the period of the great schism. The Council of Florence, held later on, proved as ineffectual as that

of Lyons had been, the union was short, and in spite of the fidelity of the Emperor himself, the great body of the Greeks remained obstinate in their schism. The end came at last, and while the nations of Europe looked on with indifference, Constantinople fell. Venice, Genoa, Naples and the Pope alone made a feeble effort to aid the Greeks in their final struggle.

It is true the Hungarians, reinforced by Christians from various countries of Europe, made a heroic attempt to stem the tide of Mahomedan invasion, but their King, Sigismund, was defeated by Bayazid, the successor of Murad. Hungary, however, continued to be the bulwark of Christendom, and finally saved Europe. The victory of Timur, the Tartar, over Bayazid granted a lease of life to the Byzantine empire. Under Mohammed I., the Ottomans soon regained their vitality, and in the reign of his successor, Murad II., we begin to hear of the glorious and immortal Hunyadi, whose victories have rendered him one of the most romantic figures of that age, though he was not always successful.

We now come to the saddest period of Byzantine and the most glorious of Ottoman history, that of the fall of Constantinople. Two figures loom up above the darkness of that awful day, when the empire of Constantine came to an end—one the victor, the other the vanquished, Mahomet II. and Constantine Paleologus. The son of Murad II. had enjoyed a most liberal education, including the knowledge of five languages. Among his virtues his sobriety was attested, but this was more than counterbalanced by his cruelty and unnatural lust. He could stoop from the heights of ambition to the basest arts of dissimulation and deceit, and while peace was on his lips war was in his heart. He was a soldier, yet he does not deserve to rank among the great conquerors of the world, for his forces were always more numerous than those of his enemies, and he frequently suffered defeat. Such is the estimate Gibbon forms of the character of Mahomet II.

Constantinople had fallen, and the echo of its fall went ringing throughout Europe, filling the hearts of Christians with consternation. Yet Christendom could not be aroused from its lethargy. The heroic age of the Crusades were a thing of the past, and the voice of Peter the Hermit was silent. The powers of the earth were too much occupied with their own selfish interests and the spirit of chivalry was dead. In vain did Nicholas V. attempt to rouse the dormant spirit; the political power of the Papacy was on the wane, and the noble-hearted Pontiff died while the Turks were menacing Christendom. In vain did the fiery Spaniard, the energetic old man, Calixtus III., on the day of his accession to the Papacy register a solemn vow that he would devote his life to the recon-

quest of Constantinople and the downfall of the Turks; in vain was the crusade preached by his order throughout all Christendom; in vain did he himself prepare armies and fleets. The masses were aroused, but the powers of the earth remained deaf. The Italian States could not agree. Alfonso of Naples evaded the difficulty by all manner of subterfuges; the empire deliberated, but did nothing. England was too much distracted by civil strife, and France positively declined to enter into the Pope's views. One country alone took part in the work, Hungary, and in that country three heroic figures stand towering above the rest as beacon lights of chivalry in a dark age. The names of Cardinal Carvajal, the Pope's Legate, the intrepid Hunyadi, and the humble friar, St. John Capistran, stand boldly inscribed in the annals of history as the champions of the Church. By their efforts, the Crusade was inaugurated, and the army of the Crusaders, hardly better equipped than those that had followed Peter the Hermit, gained the decisive victory of Belgrade, which broke the power of Mahomet II. on the continent, and hurled back the force of Mahometan invasion. Another heroic figure of this age is that of the mountaineer Skanderbeg, who for years after the downfall of Constantinople, held the Turks at bay in Albania. An attempt made by Mohammed to drive the knights out of Rhodes failed, and the following year the conqueror of Constantinople was no more.

The reign of Bayazid II. was inglorious for the Turks, but his successor, Selim I., extended the bounds of the Ottoman empire, conquered Egypt and paved the way for the reign of his son, Suleyman the Magnificent. In the beginning of his reign, Rhodes, the last bulwark of the Christians in the East, fell, and the knights capitulated on honorable terms. The year previously, Belgrade had been captured, and the way lay clear before the Turks. Hungary fell, and in 1529 Soliman and his army were before Vienna. The Ottoman empire had now reached its highest power. Had Vienna fallen, heaven only knows what the result would have been. But Divine Providence intervened, Vienna was saved, and the Sultan beat an inglorious retreat. With the death of Suleyman the long decline of the Ottoman empire began. The immortal victory gained by Don John of Austria at Lepanto over the forces of Selim II. contributed to decrease the Turkish power at sea, and the Ottomans never regained what they had lost. From the death of Murad IV., in 1640, until the beginning of the present century, the Turkish Sultans were but figureheads. The real rulers of the empire were the Grand Viziers, and one is reminded of the last days of the Merovingian dynasty. The principal wars of Turkey were now with Austria. The Poles, under John Sobieski, gained two crushing

victories over the enemies of Christendom, but the direct advantages to the Christians were slight. Once more Vienna was threatened, but the gallant Sobieski was at hand, and for a second time Vienna was saved, and to the present day we commemorate the victory of the noble King by the feast of Our Lady of the Rosary. By the peace of Passarowitz, in 1718, the Turkish frontier on the north was drawn on nearly the same line on which it remained until the Congress of Berlin.

Meanwhile Russia had appeared on the scene, and for a long time had been in occasional conflict with the Turks. Peter the Great had his eyes fixed on Constantinople, and Catherine II. continued to pursue his policy, gaining various advantages over Turkey. Again and again war broke out between Russia and Turkey, and the end is not yet. In 1808, Mahmoud II. ascended the throne and the rule of the Grand Viziers came to an end. The new Sultan found his country at war with Russia and Bonaparte at the height of his power. The latter had come into contact with the Turks as early as 1798, in the days of the Directory. Invading Egypt, he gained the battle of the Pyramids over the Mamelukes, who held the country for the Sultan, but his fleet was destroyed by Nelson at the battle of the Nile. The Sultan now declared war against the French Republic, and Bonaparte conceived the bold design of overthrowing the empire of Constantinople. His Syrian campaign was, however, a failure, and he returned defeated to Egypt, whence his troops some time later were sent back to France. At the peace of Tilsit, in 1807, a secret understanding was arrived at between Napoleon and the Russian Czar, which left Turkey to the mercy of the latter. The intrigues of Napoleon and his designs for the partition of Turkey were frustrated by Canning, the British Minister to Constantinople, who brought about peace between Russia and Turkey and the treaty of Bucharest in 1812.

Mahmoud II., when the external dangers that threatened his empire had been removed, determined to inaugurate a series of reforms and mould his government upon a European model. The all powerful body of janizaries stood in his way. For a long time they had been ruling Turkey, and like the Roman Praetorian Guard in the days of Rome's decadence, making and unmaking Sultans at their pleasure. Mahmoud determined to deal them a deathblow and exterminate them at one stroke. Their last mutiny was that of 1826. By a bold determination of the Sultan the barracks were blown up, and 40,000 janizaries perished. Never did the Sultan need an army more than at this critical juncture, for the Grecian revolution had been in progress since 1820.

This event is of supreme importance in the history of modern

Europe, as it began the dismemberment of the Turkish empire and added Greece once more, after the lapse of many centuries, to the family of European nations. Greece proper, the home of the great heroes of Hellas, became independent, although the capital of the Byzantine empire still remained in the hands of the Turk. For a brief period the Morea had been in possession of the Venetians, but it again fell into the power of the Turks, and the fate of the Greeks was worse than ever. In their distress they turned to Russia, but though the growing empire of the Czar pretended to encourage them, the aid received was more apparent than real. Meanwhile the secret society of the Hetairia began to exert a widespread influence for Hellenic freedom, and the Grecian patriots, under Prince Ipsilanti, began to invade the Danubian provinces. Russia failed to help them, and they were defeated by the Turks in 1820. The next year the rising became general. The Turkish garrison was driven from all Athens, but the Acropolis, and the Suliots rose in Albania. The Greeks were, however, defeated at Thermopylae by an overwhelming force under Omar Pasha. In 1822, Prince Mavrocordato was elected President of the Greek Republic and the Greeks gained great successes in Albania. At sea the patriots, aided especially by their fire ships, did great execution among their enemies.

The constancy and heroism of the Greeks were reechoed over Europe and America, and they found a response in many hearts. The cruelty of the Turks also gained friends for the cause of Greece, but, unfortunately for the latter, the Greeks too often imitated their enemies and rendered themselves guilty of acts of barbarism. Parties of young men calling themselves Philhellenes began to enlist in the cause of Grecian freedom, and an illustrious ally was obtained in the person of the English poet, Lord Byron. The mutual jealousies of the Greeks themselves and their want of discipline tended, however, to frustrate his intentions and to make him regret the step he had taken. Before he was able to effect anything in the cause of Grecian independence the poet died at Missolonghi, in 1824. Though the Greeks fought with heroic constancy, they proved to be their own greatest enemies by their internal divisions, although the English admiral, Lord Cochrane, and the English general, Church, did much to keep peace among the parties. A battle fought between General Church and Ibrahim Pasha resulted disastrously for the Greeks, the Acropolis was taken and nothing remained to the patriots but the citadel of Corinth and Naupliae. Their cause seemed hopeless, when England, France and Russia determined to intervene. A combined fleet of the three powers entered the Mediterranean, intending to treat with the Turks, but, accidentally as it were, a battle was precipitated which ended in the

destruction of the Turkish fleet. This engagement, known as the battle of Navarino, saved Greece, for Ibrahim Pasha, son of the Viceroy of Egypt, evacuated the Morea, while General Church drove the Turks back to the northern parts of Greece. The war ended with the declaration of the independence of Greece, and the establishment of the kingdom of the Hellenes under the protection of the powers, with Prince Otho of Bavaria as King.

The year after the massacre of the janizaries, the battle of Navarino was fought. Turkey was blockaded and the French helped to expel the Egyptians from the Morea. In 1828 war again broke out between Turkey and Russia, and in the Treaty of Adrianople the Sultan was forced to grant the independence of Greece.

Shortly after this event the Viceroy of Egypt, the Sultan's vassal, arose in rebellion, and pushing his conquests across Syria threatened the Bosphorus. Russia, whose vigilant eye is ever on Constantinople, intervened and saved the capital. As a recompense for its aid the Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelesi gave to the empire of the Czar the exclusive right of way through the Dardanelles.

While the war with Mehemet Ali, the Egyptian Viceroy, was in progress Mahmoud passed away, leaving Turkey to his son, Abd-ul-Medjid. Mahmoud II. may be ranked among the great successors of Ertoghrul, and perhaps he may be regarded as the greatest Sultan since Soliman the Magnificent.

The year 1841 is important in the history of Turkey, for in that year the English fleet, having taken Acre, Mohammed Ali was confined to his Egyptian possessions, under the zuzerainty of the Sultan. The latter himself became a ward of the great powers who assumed a protectorate over Turkey.

The greatest figure in Turkish history during the period which now followed was the British diplomatist Stratford Canning. No Christian ever exercised such influence over the Turks, and he succeeded in obtaining many reforms, while the Young Turkish Party was striving to bring Turkey up to the level of the Western nations.

In 1849 a warcloud passed over Turkey, when Russia and Austria demanded the extradition of the patriot Kossuth and others, which the Turks, advised by Canning, refused to grant. The English and French fleets at the entrance to the Hellespont prevented, however, an open rupture.

Five years later, the Crimean war broke out, the remote cause of which were troubles among the Christians in the East and the claim of Russia to a protectorate over the members of the Orthodox Greek Church. The direct occasion of the war was the sinking of a Turkish fleet by the Russians. This memorable conflict, which began in

March, 1854, ended with the fall of Sebastopol in September of the following year, and the Treaty of Paris in March, 1856.

In the Crimean war, Greece would have gladly sided with Russia against her old enemies, but England and France prevented her by force. The hatred of Turkey continued, however, to exist, and from time to time the ominous rumbling of the storm was heard, while the Eastern Question, like a black cloud, remained hanging over Europe. The frightful massacres of Scio or Chios and of Constantinople still rankled in the heart of every Greek, and the Armenian horrors have merely shown that Turkish ferocity is not dead and that the "tiger has not changed its skin."

In 1861, five years after the Crimean war, Abd-ul-Medjid, under whom so many important reforms had been obtained for Turkey, died. His successor, Abd-ul-Aziz, was destined to disappoint the hopes that had been conceived at his accession, for under the influence of his mother, the Valideh Sultana, Turkish corruption increased to an alarming extent and the empire was brought to a state of insolvency. His deposition and mysterious death, in 1876, placed his brother, Murad V., on the throne. The reign of the latter was shortlived, for, whether justly or unjustly, he was soon deposed as an imbecile and succeeded by his brother, Abd-ul-Hamid, the present Sultan. It is, perhaps, difficult to form a just estimate of the character of Abd-ul-Hamid, so different have been the judgments passed upon him, but it must be admitted that the massacres in Armenia and Constantinople, still fresh in our memory, have placed him in a most unenviable light. His reign from the beginning has been troubled. When he came to the throne, rebellion was rife in the Danubian principalities. The efforts at mediation made by the great powers failed, and Russia, separating from the European concert, declared war on Turkey in April, 1877. At first the Turks held their own, and even defeated the Russians in Asia. Ottoman Pasha defended Plevna with heroic resistance for five months, but, finally, the fortress fell, though it cost the Russians 50,000 men. The Turks had proved that their old vitality was not quite extinct. The Russians now crossed the Balkans, and pushed their way on to Adrianople. Only a short distance separated them from Constantinople, and the venerable city of the Byzantine Emperors was on the point of falling into the hands of the Czar. But Europe would not permit it, and the war ended with the Treaty of San Stefano, signed in March, 1878. The result of this war was a great decrease in Turkish territory.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, a storm which for some time had been brewing burst over the Ægean Sea. The first thunderclap was heard in the Island of Crete. Again the brave

and fierce islanders were in rebellion against the Sultan. The echo of their swords' clash was wafted over the waters, and a chord of sympathy was touched in the kingdom of Greece. The Cretans wished for annexation to that kingdom, and Greece lovingly extended its arms to the sea-girt isle, longing to clasp it to its bosom. The great powers of Europe, jealous one of the other and fearful of a general conflagration, protested. Much blustering and bullying was done, and to intimidate the little Hellenic kingdom, England, France, Germany, Italy, Austria and Russia sent their ironclads to Cretan waters. But popular enthusiasm was aroused in Greece, great pressure was brought to bear upon King George, and, in spite of the protest of the powers, Colonel Vassos was sent with his little army under the escort of Prince George's little navy, and the Greek troops took possession of Crete on February 15, 1897. The sentiment which inspired this action was one of humanity, for the Greeks of the mainland feared, and justly, a repetition of the Armenian massacres on the island. Yet it must be confessed that the act in itself was implicitly a declaration of war against Turkey, and a defiance flung into the face of the Sultan. Yet we cannot but feel admiration for Greece, that alone dared face the storm and teach to egotistic Europe the broad principles of humanity, upon which the powers, absorbed in their own petty interests, had failed to stand on the occasion of the Armenian atrocities.

The powers, to coerce Greece, threatened to institute a blockade, but such was the current of events that it became unnecessary, for in the month of April the flames of war had burst forth on the northern frontier. Alas, nothing succeeds like success. Had the Grecian arms been victorious, the world would have been ringing with the praises of the heroic little kingdom. But Greece failed, and then we heard the cry of imprudence, rashness, want of preparation, misplaced enthusiasm, and so forth. What could Greece have done? By taking the first step it became necessary to take the second. The occupation of Crete was a premise, warlike preparations on the frontier a consequence, and war with Turkey the natural conclusion.

We know the sad result, which is still fresh in our memory. After the warlike agitation, of which the "Ethnike Hetairia" was the soul, and some desultory skirmishing, actual war began. The Greeks were defeated at the Milouna Pass on April 18 and 19, and then began that disgraceful retreat from Larissa, which may be described as a complete rout. Grecian successes after this were few and unimportant, while the Turks followed up a series of victories, which might have resulted in a complete annihilation of Greece, had not the opportune armistice intervened.

We may now philosophize on this disastrous outcome of the war. We have already disposed of the question as to the rash conduct of Greece. It may now be asked, to whom is the blame to be attached? Who stands accused before the public, the King, the commander-in-chief of the army, or the army itself? It cannot be denied that things looked rather dark for Greece. The Hellenes rushed into war with flying colors amid the greatest enthusiasm, and they rushed out of it with still greater haste. Yet, laying aside all passion and prejudice, we may come to the conclusion that Greece is not culpable, and that the blame is to be attached rather to the Greek character, their want of organization, and to the force of circumstances. I think it is generally admitted that King George of Greece during his reign, a period of more than forty years, has satisfactorily acquitted himself of his duties. In the difficult position in which he was placed he did not shrink from the task before him. Toward the powers he was not defiant, yet, on the other hand, he gave no evidence of cowardice. His was a most trying position, placed as he was between Scylla and Charibdis, the European concert on the one hand, and the Greek people on the other. To reconcile them was impossible, and every impartial judge will admit that his action was the only one consistent with the safety of his dynasty, and perhaps the dictates of humanity.

Exception may, perhaps, reasonably be taken to the appointment of Prince Constantine as commander-in-chief. I doubt whether he possessed the necessary qualifications for such an important position, when the welfare of a nation was at stake, and certainly the result of the war did not place his generalship in a very favorable light.

The greatest cause of the failure of Grecian arms must finally be sought for in the Greek character, and in the poverty of their resources as compared with the Turks. The Greek is not a coward; this he has proved in many instances in his history, and though the blood which now courses in the veins of the modern Greek may no longer be the pure blood of the heroes of Marathon and Thermopylæ, yet there is enough of it left to fill him with the spirit of his ancestors, although centuries of oppression have not failed to leave their mark. The greatest defect of the modern Greek, from a military standpoint, lies in his individuality. He is brave, enthusiastic, romantic, but the spirit of the modern army, the spirit of drudgery, of discipline, in a word, the spirit of the machine is alien to him. He makes a splendid guerilla fighter, he can stand any amount of fatigue, he can swoop down with irresistible force upon an enemy from his rocky fastnesses, and pick him off from his ambuscades, but the stern monotony of that iron system called the

modern army is not in accordance with his character. Herein, I think, lies the reason why the Greeks were unable to cope with their better disciplined enemy, the Turks.

The form of Turkish government, until quite recently, was one of Oriental despotism. Supreme head of Church and State, the Ottoman Sultan was an absolute and irresponsible sovereign, whose power was limited only by the commandments of the Koran. Two subordinate officers aided him in his administration—the Grand Vizier, who was his lieutenant in the temporal administration of the empire, and the Mufti, who took his place in matters connected with religion and law. Since the reforms inaugurated in the present century, the Sultan had also his Cabinet of Ministers, which, however, was subject to his constant control. The Reis Effendi was Chief Secretary of State. The successor to the throne is the Sultan's oldest male relative. His brothers were generally kept secluded in **the palace.**

The Turkish empire is divided into a number of provinces styled Vilayets, each being under a governor general, with the title of Wali. At the head of the judiciary stands the Sheik-ul-Islam, or elder of Islam, whose duty it is to interpret the laws according to the precepts of the Koran. He is to be consulted in all important matters of state. The Nobles or Sherifs are the recognized descendants of Mohammed in the Turkish empire.

Nicholas I. called Turkey the Sick Man, yet it may not be quite so sick as the outer world is inclined to imagine, and, as the Greeks learned in their last war, to their great discomfiture. In the many wars waged by Turkey in the present century, when not taken at a disadvantage, as in the period which followed the massacre of the janizaries, Turkey has given cause for reflection to the rest of Europe. Our old enemy may appear to be dying, but there is sometimes much vitality left in a dying lion. It must be remembered that Asia Minor is the recruiting ground of the Turks; that the Asiatic hordes are still available for the service of the Crescent, and that the voice of the Sheik-ul-Islam may still summon the Mahomedan world to arms and rally it around the standard of the Prophet. It is, also, important to note that the Turks have had in their pay German officers and that the German army ranks high for military discipline. There are several military colleges in Turkey with a commendable curriculum of studies. The army consists of the standing army, the reserves, the levée en masse and the auxiliary troops. The standing army, divided into several corps, is scattered over European Turkey and the Asiatic dominions, from Constantinople to Arabia. The auxiliary forces are, perhaps, the most dreaded of the Turkish military system. They are formed of

the bashi-bazouks and various contingents from the barbarous tribes of Asia, such as the Kurds and the Arabs. These tribes are commanded by their own chiefs, who have unlimited power over their men.

At the period of the last Russian war the Turkish forces on a war footing consisted of 666,530 men, 51,009 horses, with 624 guns, a force not to be contemned. The regular army is recruited from the Mussulman population by conscription.

Since the war with Russia, it appears that the Turkish navy has considerably declined. The Turks seem to have entirely neglected it, and in the recent struggle with Greece it did not figure at all.

The Sultan is the supreme head of the land and naval forces, and next to him comes the Grand Vizier. The Minister of War, or Seraskier, directs the various services.

When we compare the present dimensions of Turkey with its frontiers in the days of its power we cannot but feel that the end is approaching. In its old extent, the empire consisted of European Turkey and the Danubian principalities, Greece and the islands, the Crimea and a portion of southern Russia, Asia Minor to the borders of Persia, Egypt, Syria, Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers and Arabia, or about 2,000,000 square miles. After the war with Russia this territory had dwindled down to 680,000 square miles, with a population of about 16,000,000.

Such is the synopsis of Turkish and Grecian history, exclusively of recent events, the consideration of which I reserve. I may now be permitted to retrace my steps for a better understanding of the Eastern question, which seems to resolve itself into this: "What is to be done with Turkey?"

When the Western empire of Rome had at last fallen under the repeated blows of the barbarians, new States arose upon its ruins, and a new order of things slowly came forth from chaos. The Eastern empire continued its existence for several centuries, but in the West the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Lombards, Celts, Franks, Anglo-Saxons and Slavonians began to settle into the condition which has brought forth our modern nations. In the East, again, a new power arose, Mahommedanism, which for a time threatened Christian civilization, while by the empire of Charlemagne the Christian nations of the West were brought into closer relationship. Out of Charlemagne's empire grew Germany, France and Italy. The ruler of Germany was also King of Italy and Emperor of the West. During the greater part of the Middle Ages, the feudal system held sway and the King's power was greatly limited by that of the powerful barons around the throne. There were no standing armies, and the monarchs depended almost entirely on the loyalty of their vassals.

The nation was, as it were, a system of confederated principalities, of which the King was the head. Relations among States were fewer than they afterwards became, but the appeal to the sword was more frequent. The Pope grew to be the central figure in international politics. In the twelfth century, the movement began which drew the nations of Western Europe closer together. The existence of a common enemy caused them to lay aside for a time their mutual enmities and to unite against Mahomedanism in the East. Thus the Christian nations were brought into closer relationship, commerce obtained a new development, and the ideas of men were broadened. The sale of old feudal estates began the downfall of feudalism; nations became accustomed to large armies, and the power of the King began to increase.

International marriages, which we find in Europe as early as the period of the Merovingian dynasty, increased as time went on and contributed one of the many sources of complications. Towards the close of the Middle Ages, feudalism fell, standing armies were created, the military arm was strengthened and a wave of absolutism swept over Europe. At the same time, the old Roman Empire passed from history at the downfall of Constantinople. Contemporary with this event we have to record the intellectual awakening of Europe known as the Renaissance, which turned the minds of men to the study of the classical works of antiquity, and produced the observation of natural phenomena from which modern science was born. Two events came now to assist this intellectual movement, and bring the nations into still closer relationship either of peace or of war. I mean the printing press, and the discovery of America. By means of the former, knowledge became universally diffused, and the discoveries of one nation in any department of human wisdom became the common property of the race. The discovery of America enlarged the horizon of men's vision, and afforded a new field of operations upon which the great maritime nations of the world—Portugal, Spain, France, England and Holland—began to display their energies. The constant contact into which they were thus brought necessitated more systematic relations; diplomacy became a science, and we begin to hear of resident ambassadors at the various courts. The affairs of one nation began to exercise a greater influence on those of its neighbors in proportion to the greater international relations which now existed. States looked with interest upon events that did not directly concern them, but the reaction of which they might feel. Thus did William III. of England become implicated in the wars of the Spanish succession, and the influence of the sea-girt isle of Albion made itself strongly felt in continental affairs.

We begin now also to hear of the balance of power. The central-

ization of national power in the monarch might easily endanger the peace of the world by raising one sovereign at the expense of others. Such has often been the case in the world's history, and it was witnessed when our century dawned with the star of Bonaparte in the ascendancy. The policy of the balance of power aimed at an equal distribution of force by means of alliances, treaties and congresses, in order that no State should have a preponderating influence over the others.

This balance of power became greatly disturbed at the great upheaval of the French Revolution, in which democracy gained a bloody triumph over absolutism, to yield in its turn to the passing despotism of Bonaparte. At Waterloo, the star of the modern Alexander set, to rise no more, and the man before whom Europe had been crouching found himself a prisoner at St. Helena. The Congress of Vienna that followed became the dividing line between the past and the present. It rearranged the States of Europe upon a new basis. Shortly before this, the Holy Alliance had been signed at Paris by Russia, Austria and Prussia, and subsequently nearly all the sovereigns of Europe joined it. Though originated by Alexander I., influenced by Madame de Krüdener, as a means of strengthening the Christian bond amongst the nations of the earth, it soon degenerated and became the weapon of absolutism against democracy. Metternich grew to be its leading spirit.

We may probably date from this period the enormous rise of plutocracy which this century has witnessed. Although ever since money has been used as a medium of exchange, it has exercised immense power over men, and the great usurers of the Middle Ages were personages to be feared, yet history has never witnessed such an accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few men and the power connected with this wealth. Until the great impulse given to trade by the maritime discoveries of the sixteenth century, nations had been accustomed to look to their own internal resources. It is true, that the Crusades had paved the way, yet foreign commerce remained for a long time the monopoly of a few cities. With the increase of foreign trade, manufacturing industry began to flourish, more capital was needed and more capital was accumulated, while with the downfall of feudalism and the increasing expenses of the concentrated government of nations, more money was required in the royal treasuries.

The earlier rulers had been accustomed to apply to their faithful subjects for aid, and not always by gentle means. This system might be kept up as long as the needs were comparatively small and as long as absolutism lasted, but with the increasing power of the people it became impossible. In Holland autocracy had been over-

thrown, and in England the Commons gained the ascendancy. From this period we begin to hear of a national debt, of which William III. of England may be called the originator. The French Revolution could only emphasize the principle thus brought into politics, and the money lenders became thus a power not to be overlooked. At the Congress of Vienna, the Rothschilds, the great financiers of modern times, were rising and their influence has remained to the present day. They are the power behind the throne. As early as 1804, Mayer Anselm Rothschild had begun to lend money to States, Denmark being one of the first to profit by his financial aid. Between 1815 and 1830, the Rothschilds had lent nearly one thousand million thalers to England, Russia, Austria, France and Prussia.

We now come more specially to our predominant subject—Turkey. The Eastern question may be said to date from the fall of Constantinople. At first a menace, the Turks were gradually admitted to the family of European nations, and to-day they are an incubus with which no one seems to know what to do. Perhaps the greatest factor in Eastern politics is Russia. Since the days of Peter the Great, the empire of the Czar has had its eyes on Constantinople, and its agents have been actively engaged abroad in promoting Russian interests.

The day when Constantinople falls into the hands of Russia, as it finally may, the world will be revolutionized. Constantinople, the key to the Orient, will become the European mart, and Asia, with its resources, will be opened up by means of a well developed railroad system to commerce and Western civilization. England, whose dominion stretches over a great portion of the Asiatic continent, and who thus far, by means of the Suez Canal, has held undisputed possession of the far East, naturally looks with a jealous eye upon these ambitions of Russia, and the rivalry between these two great powers is a clue to the understanding of the Eastern question.

The Crimean war brought the two powers into conflict. For a long time, France had been regarded as the protector of the Latin Christians in Palestine. This privilege had been accorded her by the Sultan as early as the days of Francis I., and to France was also granted the privilege of protecting the holy places in Palestine. On the other hand, in spite of this agreement with France, the Greek Church also obtained concessions, and the Greeks finally claimed as much right to take care of the Palestine sanctuaries as the Latins. Disputes arose in consequence, and, of course, France sided with the Latins, while Russia stood up for its coreligionists. Besides, Russia, extending the meaning of a clause of the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarja, signed in 1774 between Catherine II. and the Ottoman Porte, claimed a protectorate over all the Christians of the Greek

Church in Turkey. This claim was, however, not admitted by Turkey nor by the other powers. The dispute regarding the holy places of Palestine was easily settled, as the Turk did not care one way or the other, but on the second matter Turkey held its ground. Russia invaded the Danubian principalities; the Crimean war was the result. Since 1841, Turkey had been under the tutelage of the great powers. At the Crimean war the great powers separated, France and England espousing the side of Turkey against Russia. The result of this war was the Treaty of Paris. The provisions of this treaty guaranteed the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire, abolished the Russian protectorate over the Danubian principalities and Servia, which had existed for a long time, destroyed the Russian monopoly over the Black Sea, which was opened to merchant ships of all nations, and closed the Bosphorus and Dardanelles to foreign ships of war, while the Porte should be at peace. The powers pledged themselves not to meddle in the internal affairs of Turkey, and the Sultan promised reforms in his administration and a better treatment of his Christian subjects. Russia had thus been the loser, but it was only for a time, for when in 1870, France had been crippled by her war with Germany, the vital part of the treaty concerning the neutrality of the Black Sea was repudiated by the Czar, and in 1871 Mr. Gladstone's government consented to this breach of good faith.

Shortly after the Crimean war, it may be said that the disintegration of the Turkish empire began, in spite of the Treaty of Paris, which had guaranteed its integrity. In 1858 Moldavia and Wallachia became practically independent. United as Roumania, they obtained a hereditary prince in 1866. In 1874 Herzegovina rose in revolt and Bulgaria attempted to shake off the yoke in 1876. The Bulgarian massacres were the result, and in 1877 Russia declared war against Turkey. England would not permit her to occupy Constantinople if, indeed, she had intended to do so, and the Treaty of San Stefano was signed.

In virtue of this treaty, the Christian provinces obtained almost complete independence of Turkey and a new Bulgarian State was to be created, with a seaport on the *Æ*gean Sea. England refused to recognize the treaty, and the Congress of Berlin met. The two great English statesmen and rivals were at variance on the Eastern question. Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, was for supporting Turkey at all hazards as a bulwark against Russia. Mr. Gladstone maintained that it was the duty of England not to stand sponsor for the crimes of Turkey. The one occupied the selfish, utilitarian standpoint of political economy, the other stood on the broad platform of humanitarian principles. Such was the division of sentiments at

the Congress of Berlin. Jealousy of Russia prompted the one side, disgust with the atrocities of the Turks the other. Had the policy of Mr. Gladstone been adhered to, the Bulgarian atrocities would never have been followed by the Armenian and Constantinopolitan massacres.

When the dogs of Europe gathered around the Turkish bone at the Berlin Congress the pledges of 1856 were forgotten and the hollow name of "Integrity of the Turkish Empire" was thrown to the winds. There was a great scramble for the spoils, and England, as usually, did not come out last in the race. Servia, Montenegro and Roumania were declared independent. Bulgaria was divided into two portions, one autonomous, the other governed by Turkey. Thessaly was given to Greece, but that part of the treaty was not at once put into execution. Russia retained her recent conquests in Asia, and regained the strip of Bessarabia she had lost in 1856. England could not refuse the choice morsel which Turkey offered her in reward for her kindness in saving a life that had been on the point of being extinguished. Cyprus was the reward for her activity, which she was to hold in fee of the Sultan and for which she was to pay tribute. At the same time she was to assume a protectorate over the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan. This was the "peace with honor" of Lord Beaconsfield.

The Armenian massacres are not the first with which Turkey has stained its hands in this century. In 1821, in the reign of Mahmoud II., because a Greek captain had plotted to murder the Sultan and begin a revolt of the Greeks in Constantinople, thousands of Christian families were slain in that city. The Patriarch of Constantinople was barbarously put to death and massacres began throughout Turkey. The massacre of Chios or Scio alone should suffice to show what tigers the Turks are when aroused. Because two Greek captains chose to attack a Turkish garrison, dire vengeance was taken on the peaceful island that had not meddled at all with the war. The Turks killed the Greeks without mercy. Men, women and children were indiscriminately put to death. Forty thousand people were carried off into captivity, the rest being nearly all killed. Out of a population of 120,000 Christians the Turks left only 1,800 on the island.

Of what epoch is this event recorded? Does it belong to the conquests of Zingis or the inroads of the Huns? Alas, it is an occurrence of the century that gave us birth! But then it occurred in a period of war when passions were dreadfully inflamed; it belonged to the beginning of the century when the horrors of the French Revolution were still fresh in the minds of men. Such things can never occur again. Vain illusion! What did Bulgaria

witness in 1876, when the Kurds and bashi-bazouks were let loose upon the defenseless inhabitants? What has Armenia, what has Constantinople, still reeking with the blood of its most industrious inhabitants, witnessed in the old age of the preceding century?

The insurrection in Crete in 1896 was the ninth since 1669, when the island fell into the hands of the Turks. It is generally admitted, wrote Mr. Botassi in the *North American Review*, that Crete has been always one of the worst governed provinces of Turkey. The Turks at various times promised reforms, but the promises remained a dead letter, and in July, 1896, hostilities broke out between the Mussulmans and Christians. Had it not been for the intervention of the powers Crete would probably have been freed. The so-called European concert, which was really European jealousy, stood as a barrier to the liberty of the struggling island. Europe feared that if Crete became part of the Grecian monarchy other Turkish provinces might follow its example, and thus the Eastern question might be reopened.

There are those who behold another influence at work in the European concert to preserve the so-called integrity of the Turkish empire. I mean that of the moneyed powers of the world. We have seen how this force has gradually increased, especially in our times. There can be no doubt that to-day it is indeed a power behind the throne. It is well known that in the first half of the century Baron Anselm Mayer Rothschild in Frankfort controlled the money market, while the London firm of the same family wielded also an omnipotent influence. Anselm Mayer was truly king of finance, while the other banking houses were his vassals. Nathan Mayer Rothschild in England beheld the representatives of nearly all the States of Europe proud of his friendship, and the wealth of the whole Rothschild family was consolidated by intermarriage. To enter into the details of the Rothschild business would be to give the financial history of Europe during a great part of the century. Together with the Rothschilds numerous powerful banking houses have risen into power, and to-day a complicated net of finance encircles the earth. Governments that cannot carry on their operations without immense sums of money are to some extent at the mercy of these powers.

You may ask, what had this to do with the Turkish question? Well, Turkey was in debt. If the empire had fallen, who would have been responsible for this debt? This is something the creditors would like to know. The money power is a compact organization; it wields immense influence. May not this influence be wielded to uphold Turkey?

What was the secret of the Greek reverses in 1897? Was external

influence brought to bear on Greece? Was the war manipulated? Was some secret foreign influence active in Greece? Some seem to think so. I know not. For myself, I prefer to behold in the Greek disasters neither intrigue nor treachery, but the natural result of a lack of generalship and organization on the part of the Greeks. As for the integrity of the Turkish empire, it is merely a fiction, as Mr. Botassi pointed out some years ago in the *North American Review*—a fiction upheld by the mutual jealousy of the powers and by the moneyed interests of the world.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE X.

IN QUINQUAGESIMO NATALI SACERDOTII SUI EXHORTATIO AD CLERUM CATHOLICUM.

PIUS PP. X.

Dilecti filii salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

HAERENT animo penitus, suntque plena formidinis quae gentium Apostolus ad Hebreos scribebat (xiii., 17), quum illos commonens de obedientia officio praepositis debitae, gravissime affirmabat: *Ipsi enim per vigilant, quasi rationem pro animabus vestris reddituri.* Haec nimurum sententia si ad omnes pertinent, quotquot in Ecclesia praesunt, at maxime in Nos cadit, qui, licet impares, supremam in ea auctoritatem, Deo dante, obtinemus. Quare noctu atque interdiu sollicitudine affecti, meditari atque eniti non intermittimus quaecumque ad incolumitatem faciant et incrementa dominici gregis. Inter haec unum praecipue Nos occupat: homines sacri ordinis eos omnino esse, qui pro muneric officio esse debent. Persuasum enim habemus, hac maxime via de religionis statu bene esse laetiusque sperandum. Idcirco, statim ut Pontificatum inivimus, quamquam, universitatem cleri contuentibus, multiplices eius laudes elucebant, tamen venerabiles fratres catholici orbis Episcopos impensissime hortandos censuimus, ut nihil constantius nihil efficacius agerent, quam ut Christum formarent in iis, qui formando in ceteris Christo rite destinantur. Sacrorum autem Antistitum quae fuerint in hac re voluntates probe novimus. Novimus qua providentia, qua navitate in excolendo ad virtutem clero assidue committuntur: de quo illis non tam laudem impertivisse, quam gratias palam habuisse libet.

At vero, quum exhuiusmodi Episcoporum curis iam plues e clero gratulamur caelestes concepisse ignes, unde gratiam Dei, ex impositione manuum presbyterii susceptam, vel resuscitarunt vel acuerunt; tum adhuc conquerendum superest, alios quosdam per diversas regiones non ita se probare, ut in ipso tamquam in speculum, prout dignum est, plebs christiana coniiciens oculos, sumere possit quod imitetur. Ad hos porro cor Nostrum per hasce litteras patere volumus; videlicet ut cor patris, quod in conspectu aegrotantis filii anxia palpitat caritate. Hac igitur suadente, hortationibus Episcoporum hortationes addimus Nostras: quae, quamvis eo spectent potissimum ut devios torpentesve ad meliora revocent, tamen etiam

ceteris admoveant velimus incitamenta. Commonstramus iter quo quisque studiosius in dies contendat ut vere sit, qualem Apostolus nitide expressit, *homo Dei* (I. Tim. vi., 11), iustaeque expectationi Ecclesiae respondeat. Nihil plane inauditum vobis aut ciuquam novum dicemus, sed quae certe commeminasse omnes oportet: spem autem indit Deus, vocem Nostram fructum non exiguum esse habituram. Id equidem flagitamus: *Renovamini . . . spiritu mentis vestrae, et induite novum hominem, qui secundum Deum creatus est in iustitia, et sonctitate reritatis* (Ephes. iv., 23, 24); eritque hoc a vobis in quinquagesimo sacerdotii Nostri natali pulcherrimum acceptissimumque munus. Quumque Nos, *in animo contrito et spiritu humilitatis* (Dan. iii., 39), exactos in sacerdotio annos recogitabimus Deo; quidquid humani dolendum sit, videbimus quodammodo expiare, admonendo vos et cohortando *ut ambuletis digne Deo per omnia placentes* (Coloss. i., 10). Qua tamen in hortatione, non vestras tantum utilitates tuebimus, sed communes etiam catholicarum gentium; quum aliae ab aliis dissociari nequaquam possint. Etenim non eiusmodi est sacerdos, qui bonus malusve uni sibi esse queat; sed eius ratio et habitus vitae sane quantum habet consequentis effectus in populum. Sacerdos reapse bonus ubi est, quale ibi donum et quantum est!

Hinc porro, dilecti filii, hortationis Nostrae exordium capimus, ut vos nimirum ad eam vitae sanctimoniam, quam dignitatis gradus postulat, excitemus. Quicumque enim sacerdotio potitur, eo non sibi tantum, sed aliis potitur: *Omnis namque Pontifex ex hominibus assumptus, pro hominibus constituitur in iis, quae sunt ad Deum* (Hebr. v., 1). Idipsum et Christus indicavit, qui ad significandum quo demum actio sacerdotum spectet, eos cum sale itemque cum luce comparatos voluit. Lux ergo mundi, sal terrae sacerdos est. Neminem sane fugit id praecipue fieri christiana veritate tradenda: at vero quem pariter fugiat, institutionem eiusmodi pro nihilo fere esse, si quae sacerdos verbo tradat, exemplo suo non comprobet? Qui audiunt, contumeliose ii quidem, sed non immerito obiicient: *Confitentur se nosse Deum, factis autem negant* (Tit. i., 16); doctrinamque respuent, nec sacerdotis fruentur luce. Quam ob rem ipse Christus, factus sacerdotum forma, re primum, mox verbis docuit: *Coepit Iesus facere, et docere* (Act. i., 1). Item, sanctimonia posthabita, nihil admodum sacerdos sal terrae esse poterit; corruptum enim et contaminatum integratati minime aptum est conferendae: unde autem sanctitas abest, ibi corruptionem inesse oportet. Quapropter Christus, eamdem insistens similitudinem, sacerdotes tales sal infatuatum dicit, quod *ad nihilum valet ultra, nisi ut mittatur foras, atque adeo conculcetur ab hominibus* (Matth. v., 13).

Quae quidem eo apertius patent, quod sacerdotali munere haud nostro nos fungimur nomine, sed Christi Iesu. *Sic nos*, inquit Apostolus, *existimet homo ut ministros Christi, et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei* (I. Cor. iv., 1): *pro Christo ergo legatione fungimur* (II. Cor. v., 20). Hac nempe de causa Christus ipse, non ad servorum, sed ad amicorum numerum nos adscriptii: *Iam non dicam vos servos. . . . Vos autem dixi amicos: quia omnia quaecumque audivi a Patre meo, nota feci vobis. . . . Elegi vos, et posui vos ut eatis, et fructum afferatis* (Ioan. xv., 15, 16). Est igitur nobis persona Christi gerenda: legatio vero ab ipso data sic obeunda, ut quo ille intendit, eo nos pertingamus. Quoniam vero *idem velle idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia est tenemur*, ut amici, hoc sentire in nobis, quod et in Christo Iesu, qui est *sanctus, innocens, impollutus* (Hebr. vii., 26): ut legati ab eo debemus doctrinis eius ac legi conciliare fidem hominum, easdem nimirum nos ipsi primum servantes: ut potestatis eius participes ad animos vinculis culparum levandos, conari nos omni studio oportet ne illis implicemur. At maxime ut ministri eius in praecellentissimo sacrificio, quod perenni virtute pro mundi vita innovatur, debemus ea animi conformatio ne uti, qua ille ad aram crucis seipsum obtulit hostiam immaculatam Deo. Nam si olim, in specie solummodo ac figura, tanta a sacerdotibus postulabatur sanctitas; ecquid a nobis, quum victima est Christus? *Quo non oportet igitur esse puriorem tali fruentem sacrificio? quo solari radio non splendidiorem manum carnem hanc dividentem? os quod igni spirituali repletur, linguam quae tremendo nimis sanguine rubescit?* . . . (S. Io. Chrysost. hom. lxxxii. in Matth., n. 5.) Perapte S. Carolus Borromaeus, in orationibus ad clerum, sic instabat: "Si meminissemus, dilectissimi fratres, quanta et quam digna in manibus nostris posuerit Dominus Deus, quantam istiusmodi consideratio vim haberet ad nos impellendum ut vitam ecclesiasticis hominibus dignam duceremus! Quid non posuit in manu mea Dominus, quando proprium Filium suum unigenitum, sibi coaeternum et coequalem, posuit? In manu mea posuit thesauros suos omnes, sacramenta et gratias; posuit animas, quibus illi nihil est carius, quas sibi ipsi praetulit in amore, quas sanguine suo redemit: in manu mea posuit caelum, quod et aperire et claudere ceteris possim. . . . Quomodo ergo adeo ingratus esse potero tantae dignationi et dilectioni, ut peccem contra ipsum? ut illius honorem offendam? ut hoc corpus, quod suum est, inquinem? ut hanc dignitatem, hanc vitam, eius obsequio consecratam, maculem?"

Ad hanc ipsam vitae sanctimoniam, de qua iuvat paulo fusius dicere, magnis Ecclesia spectat perpetuisque curis. Sacra idcirco Seminaria instituta: ubi, si litteris ac doctrinis imbuendi sunt qui in spem cleri adolescunt, at simul tamen praecipueque ad pietatem

omnem a teneris annis sunt conformandi. Subinde vero, dum ipsa candidatos diuturnis intervallis gradatim promovet, nusquam, ut mater sedula, hortationibus de sanctitate assequenda parcit. Iucunda quidem ea sunt ad recolendum. Quum enim primo in sacram militiam cooptavit, voluit nos ea rite profiteri: *Dominus pars haereditatis meae, et calicis mei: tu es, qui restitues haereditatem meam mihi* (Ps. xv., 5). Quibus, inquit Hieronymus, monetur clericus ut qui, *vel ipse pars Domini est, vel Dominum partem habet, talem se exhibeat, ut et ipse possideat Dominum, et possideatur a Domino...* (Eph. lli., ad Nepotianum, n. 5.) Subdiaconis accensendos ipsa quam graviter est allocuta! Iterum atque iterum considerare debetis attente quod onus hodie ultro appetitis; . . . quod si hunc ordinem suscepitis, amplius non licebit a proposito resilire, sed Deo . . . perpetuo famulari, et castitatem, illo adiuvante, servare oportebit. Tum denique: *Si usque nunc fuitis tardi ad ecclesiam, amodo debetis esse assidui: si usque nunc somnolenti, amodo vigiles: . . . si usque nunc in honesti, amodo casti. . . . Videte cuius ministerium vobis traditur!* Diaconatu porro augendis sic per Antistitem a Deo precata est: *Abundet in eis totius forma virtutis, auctoritas modesta, pudor constans, innocentia, puritas et spiritualis observantia disciplinae. In moribus eorum praecepta tua fulgeant, ut suae castitatis exemplo imitationem sanctam plebs acquirat.* Sed eo acrius movet commonitio initiandis sacerdotio facta: *Cum magno timore ad tantum gradum ascendendum est, ac providendum ut caelestis sapientia, probi mores et diuturna iustitiae observatio ad id electos commendet. . . . Sit odor vitae vestrae delectamentum Ecclesiae Christi, ut praedicatione atque exemplo aedificetis domum, idest familiam Dei.* Maximeque omnium urget illud gravissime additum: *Imitanmini quod tractatis: quod profecto cum Pauli praecepto congruit: ut exhibeamus omnem hominem perfectum in Christo Iesu.* (Coloss. i., 28.)

Talis igitur quum sit mens Ecclesiae de sacerdotum vita, mirum nemini esse possit, quod sancti Patres ac Doctores omnes ita de ea re consentiant, ut illos fere nimios quis arbitretur: quos tamen si prudenter aestimemus, nihil eos nisi apprime verum rectumque docuisse iudicabimus. Eorum porro sententia haec summatim est. Tantum scilicet inter sacerdotem et quemlibet probum virum intercedere debet discriminis, quantum inter caelum et terram: ob eamque causam, virtuti sacerdotali cavendum non solum ne gravioribus criminibus sit affinis, sed ne minimis quidem. In quo virorum tam venerabilium iudicio Tridentina Synodus stetit, quum monuit clericos ut fugerent *levia etiam delicta, quae in ipsis maxima essent* (Sess. XXII., *de reform.*, c. 1.): maxima scilicet, non re ipsa, sed respectu peccantis, in quem, potiore iure quam in templorum aedi-

ficia, illud convenit: *Domum tuam decet sanctitudo.* (Ps. xcii., v.)

Iam sanctitas eiusmodi, qua sacerdotem carere sit nefas, videndum est in quo sit ponenda: id enim si quis ignoret vel praepostere accipiat, magno certe in discriminé versatur. Evidem sunt qui putent, quin etiam profiteantur, sacerdotis laudem in eo collocandam omnino esse ut sese aliorum utilitatibus totum impendat: quamobrem, dimissa fere illarum cura virtutum, quibus homo perficitur ipse (eas ideo vocitant *passivas*), aiunt vim omnem atque studium esse conferenda ut *activas* virtutes quis excolat exerceatque. Haec sane doctrina mirum quantum fallaciae habet atque exitii. De ea Decessor noster fel, rec. sic pro sua sapientia edixit (Ep. *Testem benevolentiae*, ad Archiep. Baltimor., 22 Ian. 1899): “*Christianas . . . virtutes, alias temporibus aliis accommodatas esse, is solum velit, qui Apostoli verba non meminerit: Quos praescivit, et praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis Filii sui.* (Rom. viii., 29.) Magister et exemplar sanctitatis omnis Christus est; ad cuius regulam aptari omnes necesse est, quotquot avert beatorum sedibus inseri. Iamvero haud mutatur Christus progredientibus saeculis, sed idem *heri et hodie: ipse et in saecula.* (Hebr. xiii., 8.) Ad omnium igitur aetatum homines pertinet illud: *Discite a me, quia mitis sum, et humilis corde* (Math. xi., 29); nulloque non tempore Christus se nobis exhibet *factum obedientem usque ad mortem* (Philipp. n. 8); valetque quavis aetate Apostoli sententia: *Qui . . . sunt Christi, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis et concupiscentiis.*” (Gal. v., 24.) Quae documenta si quidem spectant unumquemque fidelium proprius tamen ad sacerdotes attinent: ipsique praeceteris dicta sibi habeant quae idem Decessor Noster apostolico ardore subiecit: “*Quas utinam virtutes multo nunc plures sic colerent, ut homines sanctissimi praeteritorum temporum! qui demissione animi, obedientia, abstinentia, potentes fuerunt opere et sermone, emolumento maximo, nedum religiosae rei, sed publicae ac civilis.*” Ubi animadvertere non abs re fuerit, Pontificem prudentissimum iure optimo singularem abstinentiae mentionem intulisse, quam evangelico verbo dicimus, abnegationem sui. Quippe hoc praesertim capite, dilecti filii, robur et virtus et fructus omnis sacerdotalis munieris continetur: hoc neglecto, exoritur quidquid in moribus sacerdotis possit oculos animosque fidelium offendere. Nam si turpis lucri gratia quis agat, si negotiis saeculi se involvat, si primos appetat accubitus ceterosque despiciat, si carni et sanguini acquiescat, si quaerat hominibus placere, si fidat persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis; haec omnia inde fluunt, quod Christi mandatum negligit conditionemque respuit ab ipso latam: *Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum.* (Matth. xvi., 24.)

Ista Nos quum adeo inculcamus, illud nihilo minus sacerdotem admonemus, non sibi demum soli vivendum sancte: ipse enimvero *est operarius*, quem Christus *exit* . . . *conducere in vineam suam*. (Matth. xx., 1.) Eius igitur est fallaces herbas evellere, serere utiles, irrigare, tueri ne inimicus homo superseminet zizania. Cavendum propterea sacerdoti ne, inconsulto quodam intimae perfectionis studio adductus, quidquam praetereat de munera partibus quae in aliorum bonum conducant. Cuiusmodi sunt verbum Dei nuntiare, confessiones rite excipere, adesse infirmis praesertim morituris, ignaros fidei erudire, solari moerentes, reducere errantes, usquequaque imitari Christum: *Qui pertransiit benefaciendo et sanando omnes oppressor a diabolo.* (Act. x., 38.) Inter haec vero insigne Pauli monitum sit menti defixum: *Neque qui plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat: sed, qui incrementum dat, Deus.* (I. Cor. iii., 7.) Liceat quidem euntes et flentes mittere semina: liceat ea labore multo fovere: sed ut germinent edantque optatos fructus, id nempe unius Dei est eiusque praepotentis auxilii. Hoc accedit magnopere considerandum, nihil praeterea esse homines nisi instrumenta, quibus ad animorum salutem utitur Deus; ea oportere idcirco ut apta sint quae a Deo tractentur. Qua sane ratione? Num ulla putamus vel insita vel parta studio praestantia moveri Deum ut opem adhibeat nostram ad suae gloriae amplitudinem? Nequaquam: scriptum est enim: *Quae stulta sunt mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat sapientes: et infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia: et ignobilia mundi, et contemptibilia elegit Deus, et ea quae non sunt, ut ea quae sunt destrueret.* (I. Cor. i., 27, 28.) Unum nimur est quod hominem cum Deo coniungat, unum quod gratum efficiat, atque non indignum eius misericordiae administrum: vitae morumque sanctimonia. Haec, quae demum est supereminens Iesu Christi scientia, sacerdoti si desit, desunt ei omnia. Nam, ab ea disiunctae, ipsa exquisitae doctrinae copia (quam Nosmetipsi nitimus in clero provehere), ipsaque agendi dexteritas et sollertia, etiamsi emolumenti aliquid vel Ecclesiae vel singulis afferre possint, non raro tamen detrimenti iisdem sunt flebilis causa. Sanctimonia vero qui ornetur et affluat, is quam multa possit, vel infimus, mirifice salutaria in populo Dei aggredi et perficere, complura exomni aetate testimonia loquuntur: praecclare, non remota memoria, Ioannes Bapt. Vianney, animarum in exemplum curator, cui honores Caelitum Baetorum Nosmet decrevisse laetamur. Sanctitas una nos efficit, quales vocatio divina exposcit: homines videlicet mundo crucifixos, et quibus mundus ipse sit crucifixus; homines in novitate vitae ambulantes, qui, ut Paulus monet (II. Cor. vi., 5 *et seq.*), *in laboribus, in vigiliis, in ieiuniis, in castitate, in scientia, in longanimitate, in suavitate, in Spiritu Sancto, in charitate non facta, in verbo veri-*

tatis seipsos exhibeant ut ministros Dei; qui unice in caelestia tendant, et alios eodem adducere omni ope contendant.

Quoniam vero, ut nemo unus ignorat, vitae sanctitas eatenus fructus est voluntatis nostrae, quoad haec gratiae subsidio roboretur a Deo, abunde nobis Deus ipse providit, ne gratiae munere, si velimus, ullo tempore careamus; idque in primis assequimur studio precandi. Sane precationem inter et sanctimoniam is necessario intercedit usus, ut altera esse sine altera nullo modo possit. Quocirca consentanea omnino veritati est ea sententia Chrysostomi: *Arbitror cunctis esse manifestum, quod simpliciter impossible sit absque precationis praesidio cum virtute degere* (De prectione, orat. I): acuteque Augustinus conclusit: *Vere novit recte vivere, qui recte novit orare.* (Hom. IV. ex 50.) Quae nobis documenta Christus ipse et crebra hortatione et maxime exemplo suo firmius persuasit. Nempe orandi causa vel in deserta secedebat, vel montes subibat solus: noctes solidas totus in eo exigebat; templum frequenter adibat; quin etiam, stipantibus turbis, ipse erectis in caelum oculis palam orabat; denique suffluxus cruci, medios inter mortis dolores, cum clamore valido et lacrimis supplicavit Patri. Hoc igitur certum ratumque habeamus, sacerdotem, ut gradum officiumque digne sustineat suum, precandi studio eximie deditum esse oportere. Saepius quidem dolendum quod ipse ex consuetudine potius id faciat quam ex animi ardore; qui statis horis oscitanter psallat vel pauculas interserat preces, nec deinde ullam de die partem memor tribuat alloquendo Deo, pie sursum adspirans. Sed enim sacerdos multo impensius ceteris paruisse debet Christi praecepto: *Oportet semper orare* (Luc. xviii., 1); cui inhaerens Paulus tantopere suadebat: *Orationi instate, vigilantes in ea in gratiarum actione* (Coloss. iv., 2); *Sine intermissione orate.* (I. Thess. v., 17.) Animo quippe sanctimoniae propriae aequa ac salutis alienae cupido quam multae per diem sese dant occasiones ut in Deum feratur! Angores intimi, tentationum vis ac pertinacia, virtutum inopia, remissio ac sterilitas operum, offensiones et negligentiae creberrimae, timor demum ad iudicia divina: haec omnia valde incitant ut ploremus coram Domino, ac, praeter impetratam opem, bonis ad ipsum meritis facile ditescamus. Neque nostra tantummodo ploremus causa oportet. In ea, quae latius ubique funditur, scelerum colluvione, nobis vel maxime imploranda exorandaque est divina clementia; nobis instandum apud Christum, sub mirabili Sacramento omnis gratiae benignissime prodigum: *Parce, Domine, parce populo tuo.*

Illud in hac parte caput est, ut aeternarum rerum meditationi certum aliquod spatium quotidie concedatur. Nemo est sacerdos qui possit hoc sine gravi incuriae nota et animae detimento praetermittere. Ad Eugenium III., sibi quondam alumnū, tunc vero

romanum Pontificem, Bernardus Abbas sanctissimus scribens, eum libere obnixeque admonebat, ne unquam a quotidiana divinorum meditatione vacaret, nulla admissa excusatione curarum, quas multas et maximas supremus habet apostolatus. Id autem se iure exposcere contendebat, utilitates eiusdem exercitationis ita enumerans prudentissime: *Fontem suum, id est mentem de qua oritur, purificat consideratio. Deinde regit affectus, dirigit actus, corrigit excessus, componit mores, vitam honestat et ordinat; postremo divinarum pariter et humanarum rerum scientiam confert.* Haec est quae confusa disterminat, hiantia cogit, sparsa colligit, secreta rimatur, vera vestigat, verisimilia examinat, facta et fucata explorat. Haec est quae agenda praeordinat, acta recogitat, ut nihil in mente resideat aut incorrectum aut correctione egens... Haec est quae in prosperis adversa praesentit, in adversis quasi non sentit; quorum alterum fortitudinis, alterum prudentiae est. (De Consid. L. I., c. 7.) Quae quidem magnarum utilitatum summa, quas meditatio parere est nata, nos item docet atque admonet, quam sit illa, non modo in omnem partem salutaris, sed admodum necessaria.

Quamvis enim varia sacerdotii munia augusta sint et plena venerationis, usu tamen frequentiore fit ut ipsa tractantes non ea plane qua par est religione perpendant. Hinc, sensim defervescente animo, facilis gressus ad socordiam, atque adeo ad fastidium rerum sacerrimarum. Accedit, quod sacerdotem quotidiana consuetudine versari necesse sit quasi *in medio nationis pravae*; ut saepe, in pastoralis ipsa charitatis perfunctione, sit sibi pertimescendum ne lateant inferni anguis insidiae. Quid, quod tam est proclive, de mundano pulvere etiam religiosa corda sordescere? Apparet igitur quae et quanta urgeat necessitas ad aeternorum contemplationem quotidie redeundi, ut adversus illecebras mens et voluntas, renovato subinde robore, obfimentur. Praeterea expedit sacerdoti quadam instrui facilitate assurgendi nitendique in caelestia; qui caelestia sapere, eloqui, suadere omnino debet; qui sic debet vitam suam omnem supra humana instituere, ut, quidquid pro sacro munere agit secundum Deum agat, instinctu ductuque fidei. Iamvero hunc animi habitum, hanc veluti nativam cum Deo coniunctionem efficit maxime ac tuetur quotidiana meditationis praesidium; id quod prudenti cuique tam perspicuum est, ut nihil opus sit longius persequi. Quarum rerum confirmationem petere licet, sane tristem, ex eorum vita sacerdotum, qui divinorum meditationem vel parvi pendunt vel plane fastidiunt. Videas enim homines, in quibus *sensus Christi*, illud tam praestabile bonum, oblanguit; totos ad terrena conversos, vana consectantes, leviora effutientes; sacrosancta obeuntes remisso, gelide, fortasse indigne. Iam pridem ipsi, unctionis sacerdotalis recenti charismate perfusi, diligenter parabant ad psallendum

animam, ne perinde essent ac qui tentant Deum; opportuna quaerabant tempora locaque a strepitu remotiora; divina scrutari sensa studebant; laudabant, gemebant, exsultabant, spiritum effundebant cum Psalte. Nunc vero, quantum mutati ab illis sunt! . . . Itemque vix quidquam in ipsis residet de alacri ea pietate quam spirabant erga divina mysteria. Quam dilecta erant olim tabernacula illa! gestiebat animus adesse incircitu mensae Domini, et alios ad eam atque alios advocare pios. Ante sacrum quae mundities, quae preces desiderantis animae! tum in ipso agendo quanta erat reverentia, augustis caeremoniis decore suo integris; quam effusae ex praecordiis gratiae: feliciterque manabat in populum bonus odor Christi! . . . *Rememoramini*, obsecramus, dilecti filii *rememoramini* . . . *pristinos dies* (Hebr. x., 32): tunc nempe calebat anima, sanctae meditationis studio enutrita.

In his autem ipsis, qui *recognitare corde* (Ierem. xii., 11) gravantur vel negligunt, non desunt sane qui consequentem animi sui egestatem non dissimulent, excusentque, id causae obtendentes, se totos agitationi ministerii dedidisse, in multiplicem aliorum utilitatem. Verum falluntur misere. Nec enim assueti cum Deo colloqui, quum de eo ad homines dicunt vel consilia christianaे vitae impertиunt, prorsus carent divino afflato; ut evangelicum verbum videatur in ipsis fere intermortuum. Vox eorum, quantavis prudentiae vel facundiae laude clarescat, vocem minime reddit Pastoris boni, quam oves salutariter audiant: strepit enim diffluitque inanis, atque interdum damnosи fecunda exempli, non sine religionis dedecore et offensione bonorum. Nec dissimiliter fit in caeteris partibus actuosaе vitae: quippe vel nullus inde solidae utilitatis proventus, vel brevis horae, consequitur, imbre deficiente caelesti, quem sane devocat uberrimum *oratio humilantis se* (Eccl. xxxv., 21). Quo loco facere quidem non possumus quin eos vehementer doleamus, qui pestiferis novitatibus abrepti, contra haec sentire non vereantur, impensamque meditando et precando operam quasi perditam arbitrentur. Proh funesta caecitas! Utinam, secum ipsi probe considerantes, aliquando cognoscerent quorsum evadat neglectus iste contemptusque orandi. Ex eo nimirum germinavit superbia et contumacia; unde nimis amari excrevere fructus, quos paternus animus et commemorare refugit et omnino resecare exoptat. Optatis annuat Deus; qui benigne devios respiciens, tanta in eos copia *spiritum gratiae et precum* effundat, ut errorem deflentes suum, male desertas vias communi cum gaudio volentes repeatant, cautiorese persequantur. Item ut olim Apostolo (Philipp. i., 8), ipse Deus sit Nobis testis, quo modo eos omnes cupiamus in visceribus Iesu Christi!

Illis igitur vobisque omnibus, dilecti filii, alte insideat hortatio Nostra, quae Christi Domini est: *Videte, vigilate, et orate.* (Marc.

xiii., 33). Praecipue in pie meditandi studio uniuscuiusque elaboret industria: elaboret simul animi fiducia, identidem rogantis: *Domine, doce nos orare.* (Luc. xi., 1.) Nec parvi quidem momenti esse nobis ad meditandum debet peculiaris quaedam causa; scilicet quam magna vis consilii virtutisque inde profluat, bene utilis ad rectam animarum curam, opus omnium perdifficile. Cum re cohaeret, et est memoratu dignum, Sancti Caroli pastorale alloquium: “Intelligite, fratres, nil aequa ecclesiasticis omnibus viris esse necessarium ac est oratio mentalis, actiones nostras omnes praecedens, concomitans et subsequens: *Psallam*, inquit propheta, *et intelligam.* (Ps. c., 2.) Si Sacra mentis ministras, a fratre, meditare quid facis; si Missam celebras, meditare quid offers; si psallis, meditare cui et quid loqueris; si animas regis, meditare quoniam sanguine sint lavatae. (Ex orationib. ad clerum.) Quapropter recte ac iure Ecclesia nos ea davidica sensa iterare frequentes iubet: *Beatus vir, qui in lege Domini meditatur; voluntas eius permanet die ac nocte; omnia quaecumque faciet semper prosperabuntur.* Ad haec, unum denique instar omnium sit nobile incitamentum. Sacerdos enim, si alter *Christus* vocatur et est communicatione potestatis, nonne talis omnino et fieri et haberi debeat etiam imitatione factorum? . . . *Summum igitur studium nostrum sit in vita Iesu Christi meditari.* (De imit. Chr. i., 1.)

Cum divinarum rerum quotidiana consideratione magni refert ut sacerdos piorum librorum lectionem, eorum in primis qui divinitus inspirati sunt, coniungat assiduus. Sic Paulus mandabat Timotheo: *Attende lectioni.* (I. Tim. iv., 13.) Sic Hieronymus, Nepotianum de vita sacerdotali instituens, id inculcabat: *Nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur:* cuius rei hanc subtexebat causam: *Disce quod doceas: obtine eum, qui secundum doctrinam est, fidelem sermonem, ut possis exhortari in doctrina sana, et contradicentes revincere.* Quantum enimvero proficiunt sacerdotes qui constanti hoc praestant assuetudine; ut sapide praedicant Christum utque mentes animosque audientium, potius quam emolliant et mulceant, ad meliora impellunt, ad superna erigunt desideria! Sed alia quoque de causa, atque ea in rem vestram, dilecti filii, frugifera, praceptio valet eiusdem Hieronymi: *Semper in manu tua sacra sit lectio.* (Ep. 58 ad Paulinum, n. 6.) Quis enim nesciat maximam esse in amici animum vim cuiuspiam amici qui candide moneat, consilio iuvet, carpat, excitet, ab errore avocet? *Beatus, qui invenit amicum verum* (Eccl. xxv., 12) . . . *qui autem invenit illum, invenit thesaurum...* (Ib., vi., 14.) Iamvero amicos vere fideles adscribere ipsis nobis pios libros debemus. De nostris quippe officiis ac de praescriptis legitimae disciplinae graviter commonefaciunt; repressas in animo caelestes voces suscitant; desidiam propositorum castigant;

dolosam obturbant tranquillitatem; minus probabiles affectiones, dissimulatas, coarguunt; pericula detegunt, saepenumero incautis patentia. Haec autem omnia sic illi tacita cum benevolentia praestant, ut se nobis non modo amicos praebeant, sed amicorum perquam optimos praebeant. Siquidem habemus, quum libeat, quasi lateri adhaerentes, intimis necessitatibus nulla non hora promptos; quorum vox nunquam est acerba, consilium nunquam cupidum, sermo nunquam timidus aut mendax. Librorum piorum saluberrimam efficacitatem multa quidem eaque insignia declarant exempla; at exemplum profecto eminet Augustini, cuius promerita in Ecclesiam amplissima inde auspicium duxerunt: *Tolle, lege; tolle, lege . . . Arripui* (epistolas Pauli apostoli), *aperui et legi in silentio. . . . Quasi luce securitatis infusa cordi meo, omnis dubitationis tenebrae diffugerunt.* (Conf. I, viii., c. 12.) Sed contra heu! saepius accidit nostra aetate, ut homines e clero tenebris dubitationis sensim offundantur et saeculi obliqua sectentur, eo praesertim quod piis divinisque libris longe alios omne genus atque ephemeridum turbam praeoptent, ea quidem scatentia errore blando ac lue. Vobis, dilecti filii, cavete: adultae proiectaeque aetati ne fidite, neve sinite spe fraudulenta illudi, ita vos posse aptius communi bono prospicere. Certi custodiantur fines, tum quos Ecclesiae leges praestituant, tum quos prudentia cernat et charitas sui: nam venena istaec semel quis animo imbiberit, concepti exitii perraro quidem effugiet damna.

Porro emolumenta, tum a sacra lectione, tum ex ipsa meditatione caelestium quaesita, futura certe sunt sacerdoti uberiora, si argumenti quidpiam accesserit, unde ipsemet dignoscat an lecta et meditata religiose studeat in usu vitae perficere. Est apposite ad rem egregium quoddam documentum Chrysostomi, sacerdoti praesertim exhibut. Quotidie sub noctem, antequam somnus obrepatur, *excita iudicium conscientiae tuae, ab ipsa rationem exige, et quae interdiu mala cepisti consilia . . . fodica et dilania, et de eis poenam sume.* (Exposit. in Ps. iv., n. 8.) Quam rectum id sit ac fructuoso christiana virtuti, prudentiores pietatis magistri luculenter evincunt, optimis quidem monitis et hortamentis. Praeclarum illud referre placet e disciplina Sancti Bernardi: *Integritatis tuae curiosus explorator, vitam tuam in quotidiana discussione examina. Attende diligenter quantum proficias, vel quantum deficias. . . . Stude cognoscere te. . . . Pone omnes transgressiones tuas ante oculos tuos... Statue te ante te, tamquam ante alium; et sic te ipsum plange.* (Meditationes piissimae, c. v., de quotid. sui ipsius exam.)

Etiam in hac parte probrosum vere sit, si Christi dictum eveniat: *Filiu huius saeculi prudentiores filii lucis!* (Luc. xvi., 8.) Videre licet quanta illi sedulitate sua negotia procurent: quam saepe data

et accepta conferant; quam accurate restricteque rationes subducant; iacturas factas ut doleant, seque ipsi acrius excident ad sarciendas. Nos vero, quibus fortasse ardet animus ad aucupandos honores, ad rem familiarem augendam, ad captandam praesidio scientiae praedicationem unice et gloriam; negotium maximum idemque perarduum, sanctimoniae videlicet adceptionem, languentes, fastidiosi tractamus. Nam vix interdum apud nos colligimus et exploramus animum; qui propterea paene silvescit, non secus ac vinea pigri, de qua scriptum: *Per agrum hominis pigri transivi, et per vineam viri stulti: et ecce totum repleverant urticae, et operuerunt superficiem eius spinae, et maceria lapidum destructa erat.* (Prov. xxiv., 30, 31.) Ingravescit res, crebrescentibus circum exemplis pravis, sacerdotali ipsi virtuti haud minime infestis; ut opus sit vigilantius quotidie incedere ac vehementius obniti. Iam experiendo cognitum est, qui frequentem in se censuram et severam de cogitatis, de dictis, de factis peragat, eum plus valere animo: simul ad odium et fugam mali, simul ad studium et ardorem boni. Neque minus experiendo compertum, quae incommoda et damna fere accident declinanti tribunal illud, ubi sedeat iudicans iustitia, stet rea et ipsum accusans conscientia. In ipso frustra quidem desideres eam agendi circumspectionem, quae adeo in christiano homine probatur, de minoribus quoque noxis vitandis; eamque verecundiam animi, maxime sacerdotis propriam, ad omnem vel levissimam in Deum offensam expavescentis. Quin immo indiligentia atque neglectus sui nonnunquam eo deterius procedit, ut ipsum negligant poenitentiae sacramentum: quo nihil sane opportunius infirmitati humanae suppeditavit Christus insigni miseratione. Diffitendum certe non est, acerbeque est deplorandum, non ita raro contingere, ut qui alias a peccando fulminea sacri eloquii vi deterret, nihil tale metuat sibi culpisque obcallescat; qui alias hortatur et incitat ut labes animi ne morentur debita religione detergere, id ipse tam ignave faciat atque etiam diuturno mensium spatio cunctetur; qui aliorum vulneribus oleum et vinum salutare novit infundere, sauciis ipse secus viam iaceat, nec medicam fratriis manum, eamque fere proximam, providus sibi requirat. Heu quae passim consecuta sunt hodieque consequuntur, prorus indigna coram Deo et Ecclesia, perniciosa christiana multitudini, indecora sacerdotali ordini!

Haec Nos, dilecti filii, pro conscientiae officio quum reputamus, oppletur animus aegritudine, et vox cum gemitu erumpit; Vae sacerdoti, qui suum tenere locum nesciat, et nomen Dei sancti, cui esse sanctus debet, infideliter polluat! Optimorum corruptio, teterimum: *Grandis dignitas sacerdotum, sed grandis ruina eorum, si peccant; laetemur ad ascensum, sed timeamus ad lapsum: non est tanti gaudii excelsa tenuisse, quanti moeroris de sublimioribus cor-*

ruisse! (S. Hieron. in Ezech. i., 13, c. 44, v. 30.) *Vae igitur sacerdoti, qui, immemor sui, precandi studium deserit; qui piarum lectionum pabulum respuit; qui ad se ipse nunquam regreditur ut accusantis conscientiae exaudiat voces!* *Neque crudescentia animi vulnera, neque Ecclesiae matris ploratus movebunt miserum, donec eae feriant terribiles minae:* *Excaeca cor populi huius, et aures eius aggrava: et oculos eius clade: ne forte videat oculis suis, et auribus suis audiat, et corde suo intelligat, et convertatur, et sanem eum.* (Is. vi., 10.) *Triste omen ab unoquoque vestrum, dilecti filii, avertat dives in misericordia Deus; ipse qui Nostrum intuetur cor, nulla prorsus in quemquam amaritudine affectum, sed omni pastoris et patris charitate in omnes permotum:* *Quae est enim nostra spes, aut gaudium, aut corona gloriae? nonne vos ante Dominum Nostrum Iesum Christum?* (I. Thess. ii., 19.)

At videtis ipsi, quotquot ubique estis, quaenam in tempora, arcano Dei consilio, Ecclesia inciderit. Videte pariter et meditamini quam sanctum officium vos teneat, ut a qua tanto dignitatis honore donati estis, eidem contendatis adesse et succurrere laboranti. Itaque in clero, si unquam alias, nunc opus maxime est virtute non mediocri; in exemplum integra, experrecta, operosa, paratissima demum facere pro Christo et pati fortia. Neque aliud quidquam est quod cupidiore Nos animo precemur et optemus vobis, singulis et universis. In vobis igitur intemperato semper honore floreat castimonia, nostri ordinis lectissimum ornamentum; cuius nitore sacerdos, ut adsimilis efficitur angelis, sic in christiana plebe venerabilior praestat sanctisque fructibus fecundior. Vigeat perpetuis auctibus reverentia et obedientia, iis sollempni ritu promissa, quos divinus Spiritus rectores constituit Ecclesiae: praecipue in obsequio huic Sedi Apostolicae iustissime debito mentes animique arctioribus quotidie fidelitatis nexibus devinciantur. Excellatque in omnibus charitas, nullo modo quaerens quae sua sunt: ut, stimulis qui humanitus urgent invidiae contentionis cupidaeve ambitionis cohibitis, vestra omnium studia ad incrementa divinae gloriae fraterna aemultatione conspirent. Vestrae beneficia charitatis *multitudo magna languentium, caecorum, claudorum, aridorum*, quam miserrima, expectat; vel maxime expectant densi adolescentum greges, civitatis et religionis spes carissima, fallaciis undique cincti et corruptelis. Studete alacres, non modo sacra catechesi impertienda, quod rursus enixiusque commendamus, sed, omni quacumque liceat ope consilii et sollertiae, bene optimeque mereri de omnibus. Sublevando, tutando, medendo, pacificando, hoc demum velitis ac propemodum sitiatis, lucrari vel obstringere animas Christo. Ab inimicis eius heu quam impigre, quam laboriose, quam non trepide agitur, instatur, exitio animarum immenso! Ob hanc potissime charitatis laudem

Ecclesia catholica gaudet et gloriatur in clero suo, christianam pacem evangelizante, salutem atque humanitatem afferente, ad gentes usque barbaras: ubi ex magnis eius laboribus, profuso nonnunquam sanguine consecratis, Christi regnum latius in dies profertur, et fides sancta enitet novis palmis augustior. Quod si, dilecti filii, effusae charitatis vestrae officiis simultas, convicium, calumnia, ut persaepe fit, responderit, nolite ideo tristitiae succumbere, *nolite deficere bene facientes* (II. Thess. iii., 13). Ante oculos obversentur illorum agmina, numero meritisque insignia, qui per Apostolorum exempla, in contumeliis pro Christi nomine asperrimis, *ibant gaudentes, male-dicti benedicebant*. Nempe filii sumus fratresque Sanctorum, quorum nomina splendent in libro vitae, quorum laudes nuntiat Ecclesia: *Non inferamus crimen gloriae nostrae!* (I. Mach. ix., 10.)

Instaurato et aucto in ordinibus cleri spiritu gratiae sacerdotalis, multo quidem efficacius valebunt Nostra, Deo adspirante, proposita ad caetera, quaecumque late sunt, instauranda. Quapropter ad ea quae supra exposuimus, certa quaedam adiicere visum est, tamquam subsidia eidem gratiae custodienda et alendae opportuna. Est primum, quod nemini sane non cognitum et probatum, sed non item omnibus re ipsa exploratum est, pius animae recessus ad Exercitia, quae vocant, spiritualia; annuus, si fieri possit, vel apud se singulatim, vel potius una cum aliis, unde largior esse fructus consuevit; salvis Episcoporum praescriptis. Huius instituti utilitates iam Ipsi satis laudavimus, quum nonnulla in eodem genere ad cleri romani disciplinam pertinentia ediximus. (Ep. *Experiendo* ad Card. in Urbe Vicarium, 27 Decembris, 1904.) Nec minus deinde proficiet animis, si consimilis recessus, ad paucas horas, menstruus, vel privatum vel communiter habeatur: quem morem libentes videmus pluribus iam locis inductum, ipsis Episcopis faventibus, atque inter dum praesidentibus coetui. Aliud praeterea cordi est commendare: adstrictiorem quamdam sacerdotum, ut fratres addebet, inter se coniunctionem, quam episcopalis auctoritas firmet ac moderetur. Id sane commendabile, quod in societatem coalescant ad mutuam opem in adversis parandam, ad nominis et munerum integritatem contra hostiles actus tuendam, ad alias istiusmodi causas. At pluris profecto interest, consociationem eos inire ad facultatem doctrinæ sacrae excolendam, in primisque ad sanctum vocationis propositum impensiore cura retinendum, ad animarum provehendas rationes, consiliis viribusque colatis. Testantur Ecclesiae annales, quibus temporibus sacerdotes passim in communem quamdam vitam conveniebant, quam bonis fructibus id genus societas abundarit. Tale aliquid quidni in hanc ipsam aetatem, congruenter quidem locis et muniiis, revocari queat? Pristini etiam fructus, in gaudium Ec-

clesiae, nonne sint recte sperandi? Nec vero desunt instituti similis societates, sacrorum Antistitum comprobatione auctae; eo utiliores, quo quis maturius, sub ipsa sacerdotii initia, amplectatur. Nosmet ipsi unam quamdam, bene aptam experti, fovimus in episcopali munere, eamdem etiamnum aliasque singulari benevolentia prosequimur. Ista sacerdotalis gratiae adiumenta, eaque item quae vigil Episcoporum prudentia pro rerum opportunitate suggerat, vos, dilecti filii, sic aestimate, sic adhibete, ut magis in dies magisque *digne ambuletis vocatione qua vocatis estis* (Ephes. iv., 1), ministerium vestrum honorificantes, et perficientes in vobis Dei voluntatem, quae nempe est *sanctificatio vestra*.

Huc enimvero feruntur praecipuae cogitationes curaeque Nostrae: propterea sublatis in cælum oculis, supplices Christi Domini voces super universum clerum frequenter iteramus: *Pater sancte . . . sanctifica eos.* (Ioan. xvii., 11, 17.) In qua pietate laetamur permultos ex omni fidelium ordine Nobiscum comprecantes habere, de communi vestro et Ecclesiae bono vehementer sollicitos: quin etiam iucundum accidit, haud paucas esse generosioris virtutis animas, non solum in sacratis septis, sed in media ipsa saeculi consuetudine, quae ob eamdem causam sese victimas Deo votivas non intermissa contentione exhibeant. Puras eximiasque eorum preces in odorem suavitatis summus Deus accipiat, neque humillimas abnuat preces Nostras. Faveat, exoramus, clemens idem et providus: atque e sanctissimo dilecti Filii sui Corde divitias gratiae, caritatis, virtutis omnis universum in clerum largiatur. Postremo, libet gratam ex animo vicem referre vobis, dilecti filii, de votis faustitatis quae, appetente sacerdotii Nostri natali quinquagesimo, multiplici pietate obtulisti: votaque pro vobis Nostra, quo cumulatius eveniant, magnae Virgini Matri concredita volumus, Apostolorum Reginae. Haec etenim illas sacri ordinis felices primitias exemplo suo edocuit quemadmodum perseverarent unanimes in oratione, donec induerentur superna virtute: eamdemque ipsis virtutem multo sane ampliorem sua deprecatione impetravit, consilio auxit et communivit, ad fertilitatem laborum laetissimam. Optamus interea, dilecti filii, ut pax Christi exultet in cordibus vestris cum gaudio Spiritus Sancti; auspice Apostolica Benedictione, quam vobis omnibus peramanti voluntate impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die 4 Augusti anno 1908,
Pontificatus Nostri ineunte sexto.

PIUS PP. X.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Ph. D., LL. D., Edward G. Pace, Ph. D., D. D., Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Conde B. Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D., John J. Wynne, S. J., assisted by numerous collaborators. In fifteen royal 8vo. volumes. Vol. IV., 799 pages, with illustrations and maps. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

The Catholic Encyclopedia is fast becoming a reality. The fourth volume almost completes one-third of the work, and, indeed, if we take into consideration the condition of the fifth volume, practically ready for the press, and the great amount of advance editorial work already done on the succeeding volumes, we may truthfully say that the Encyclopedia is more than one-third finished.

The present volume begins with Clandestinity and ends with Diocesan. In the eight hundred royal octavo pages of the book, between these two subjects, we find as complete and comprehensive a collection of treatises on Catholic subjects as the very learned and experienced and indefatigable board of editors could gather together. We find them treated by writers best suited for the purpose, generally specialists, chosen from the best institutions of learning throughout the world and from the learned professions, each with a national reputation, and many with an international one. We find each subject allotted the amount of space due to it, considered in itself, and in relation to the other subjects, as far as good experienced judgment can make such allotment, and allowing for the difference of opinion which must always exist in such cases.

We notice that the illustrations are well chosen and beautifully executed. Indeed, in this respect we have never seen more even excellence. We are struck by the attention given to short articles, for instead of entrusting the writing of them to less competent and unknown writers, as is so often done in similar works, the editors have wisely given special attention to them and placed them in the hands of scholars always fully competent, and generally very well known and very learned. In this way the book as a whole is brought up to the highest standard. As illustrating this point, we may mention the biographical and historical contributions of Mgr. Loughlin and Dr. Shahan, the philosophical contributions of Dr. Pace and the excellent short articles on the ceremony and liturgy by Father Thurston, S. J.

Among the more important and lengthy articles in the present volume we notice the Cross occupying twenty pages and treated by several well-known writers. The illustrations of this subject are

unusually good, especially the page showing crosses of every form.

The Crusades, ever fruitful subject, takes up thirteen pages. Constantinople, city and councils, covers twenty pages, the second part of the subject being treated by Dr. Shahan in his best style. The Congo attracts unusual attention just now, because of the charges which have been brought against the Belgian Government in its management of affairs. The Concordat is equally interesting and timely. The paper on Communion has a special value because of the Holy Father's recent recommendation of a return to the ancient practice of frequent Communion. A more than usually striking article is the one on Columbus, occupying nine pages, fully illustrated with portraits and other pictures.

The mere mention of only a few of the striking features of this volume is sufficient to indicate the great importance of the work as a whole and to emphasize the truth that each volume has an individual value which cannot be exaggerated. Those who intend to subscribe for the book should do so at once and secure for themselves the pleasure and profit of each volume as it appears. We can think of only one good reason why any Catholic should fail to subscribe for the Encyclopedia, and that is lack of means.

HISTOIRE COMPAREE DES RELIGIONS PAIENNES ET DE LA RELIGION JUIVE
JUSQU'AU TEMPS D'ALEXANDRE LE GRAND. Par *Albert Dufourcq*. Paris:
Bloud et Cie. Pp. xxvi. + 350. Price, 3½ francs.

The book here introduced is the first volume of a series bearing the general title "l'Avenir du Christianisme," the author considering that the "present of Christianity" can be properly understood and its "future" predicted only by reverting to its "past"—even to the religious history of pre-Christian times, pagan and Jewish. He accordingly embodies in the book at hand the results of his investigation amongst the ancient religions. Beginning with the Egyptians, passing thence to the Semites (Babylon, Anam, Palestine), thence to the Aryans (Greece, Rome, Gaul), next to the Jews, first during patriarchal and Mosaic times, then under the Prophets, he concludes the volume by instituting a comparison between the pagan cults and the Jewish religion. The breadth of the foundation thus laid is obvious enough. For its depth and solidity the indications of laborious research, attested by the copious documentary references—together with the author's position as professor at the University of Bordeaux, to say nothing of his scholarship, confirmed by a number of preceding works on kindred lines of research—may be accepted as presumptive testimony. The spirit in which the work is wrought out is at least suggested by the dedication prefixed, "*In Honoram*

Leonis Papae XIII. Jesu Christi Vicarii Ecclesiarum Unitatis Pro-pugnatoris Auctor Pietatis Causa," the unity thus idealized being further emphasized by the texts suggesting the thought embodied in the preface: "*Pater Noster qui es in coelis. Mandaum novum do vobis. Ut omnes unum sint. Deus homo factus est ut homo deus fieret.*" The reviewer mentions these signs of the author's reverential attitude because the reader should have them in mind when perusing the parallelisms of rite and belief which are traced in the work between the pre-Christian cults and the Christian religions in illustration of the thesis that the "end of history is the realization of a common consciousness and conscience in humanity, Christianity being the form of that universal conscience." In connection with this thesis the parallelisms brought forward may be justified and the reader's religious sensitiveness less rudely jarred. Of course, the author maintains the "transcendency" of Christianity, as he also explicitly establishes that of Judaism over pagan worships. In respect, however, to the latter superiority it had been well to have developed the truth that Jahve, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God to whom the Psalms and the pleadings found in the Sapiertial Books are addressed, was no less the God of the individual Jew than the protector of the collective people. The author seems to merge the former in the latter relationship. As was mentioned above, the present volume represents but one portion of the entire work, the Oriental epoch. The complete plan calls for three more volumes, which will contain the history of "the syncretist epoch," including "les origenes chrétiennes" (from Alexander to the third century, Vol. II.); the Mediterranean epoch (the history of the Church down to the eleventh century, Vol III.); the Occidental epoch (history of the Church down to the eighteenth century, Vol IV.). These three are in course of publication. A second part preparing is to embrace the nineteenth century (Christianity and democracy). A more adequate estimate of the work will be possible when these portions shall have appeared.

PRINCIPLES OF LOGIC. By *George Hayward Joyce, S. J., M. A.*, Oriel College, Oxford; Professor of Logic, St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. 8vo., pp. xx.+481. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1908.

Even a casual glance at this book is sufficient to convince the reader that a master mind and a master hand have been brought to its making. It is complete, covering the whole subject, and it is done in such an attractive way as to make the subject very interesting. A quotation from the author's introduction will show this, and will be the best recommendation which we can give to the book:

"This work is an attempt at a presentment of what is frequently termed Traditional Logic, and is intended for those who are making acquaintance with philosophical questions for the first time. Yet it is impossible, even in a text-book such as this, to deal with logical questions save in connection with definite metaphysical and epistemological principles. Logic, as the theory of the mind's rational processes in regard of their validity, must necessarily be part of a larger philosophical system. Indeed, when this is not the case, it becomes a mere collection of technical rules, possessed of little importance and of less interest. The point of view adopted in this book is that of the scholastic philosophy; and as far as is compatible with the size and purpose of the work, some attempt has been made to vindicate the fundamental principles on which that philosophy is based. From one point of view, this position should prove a source of strength. The thinkers who elaborated our system of Logic were Scholastics. The principles of that philosophy, its doctrines and its rules, are in full accord. In the light of Scholasticism the system is a connected whole, and the subjects traditionally treated in it have each of them its legitimate place.

"From another point of view it might seem that Scholastic principles must be a source of weakness. Have not, it will be asked, the universities, one and all, long since discarded Scholasticism? That this is true of all those universities which have submitted to secular influences must be frankly admitted. At our ancient seats of learning there has been a complete neglect of the great mediæval philosophers, the representatives of that once famous school. The names of Albert the Great, of St. Thomas Aquinas, of Duns Scotus are never mentioned. It is not that they are weighed and found wanting. They are ignored. It is assumed that there is nothing in them worth knowing. The practice of what certain German writers have termed 'the leap over the Middle Ages' has been universal. From Plotinus to Bacon has been regarded as a blank in the history of philosophy. Yet by common consent the period thus ignored was one of intense philosophic activity. Metaphysical problems were discussed with an interest, a zeal, an acumen since unknown, and some of the greatest intellects the world has ever seen were nurtured in the schools of the day. When, therefore, the Neo-Scholastics of to-day avail themselves of the results attained in that epoch, no wise man will consider that this is likely to impair the value of their conclusions. They are but claiming their share in the great inheritance of the past.

"It is not, of course, to be supposed that the Neo-Scholasticism of to-day is in all points identical with the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages. The astronomical physics of the mediæval doctors were

theoretically erroneous. Moreover, new questions have arisen, new difficulties have been suggested, new discoveries have been made. The adversaries of to-day are not the adversaries against whom the mediæval doctors were called to contend. In adapting our methods to the needs of the day we do not discard the principles of the Scholastics. But Neo-Scholasticism belongs to the twentieth century, not to the thirteenth, and it employs the weapons of a new age."

LES ORIGINES DU SCHISME ANGLICANE (1509-1571). Par M. l'Abbé J. Trésal. Pp. xvii.+460. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1908. Price, 3½ francs.

The present monograph on the rise and early development of the rupture of England with the Holy See and the consequent establishment of the distinctly schismatical English Church forms the latest addition to the "Library of Ecclesiastical History," several preceding volumes whereof have been previously reviewed in these pages. The period covered by the volume extends from the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII. (1509) to the thirteenth year of Elizabeth's reign, in 1571. The narrative is introduced by a summary account of the doctrines, events, political and social, that prepared the way for the schism, which took place in 1534. Henry was satisfied with substituting himself for the Pope in the headship of the Church in England. Up to his death, in 1547, he strove, despite some transient affection for the Lutherans, to pass for orthodox and to preserve intact the body of Catholic teaching, except that of the primacy of the Holy See. Under his son, Edward VI. (1547-1552), the English Church "went to school," as M. Trésal puts it, to the Lutherans, then to the Calvinists, accepting *dans une hâte un peu fébrile* their dogmatic formularies as well as their liturgical and disciplinary practices. The death of Edward at once interrupted this march of events. With Mary (1552-1558) the Catholic Church was for a time reinstated and reconciled to the Holy See, but the Queen died before the reestablishment could be solidified. Elizabeth, her sister, aided by adroit ministers and by Bishops hostile to Rome, revived the policy of Edward, and, undeterred by any moral or religious scruple, pushed her design so skillfully that even the Catholic rulers on the Continent did not break off relations with her. At length, however (in 1571), the Pope, undeceived by Elizabeth's duplicity, solemnly excommunicated the English Queen, who took her revenge by causing Parliament to pass laws of merciless persecution against the Catholics of her realm. At this time the "Book of Common Prayer" and "The Thirty-nine Articles" received the sanction of the clergy and of Parliament. The two documents gave to the new Church its constitutive organs,

a doctrinal formulary, a liturgical and disciplinary code and its supreme head in the person of the sovereign. It is this period as thus outlined that M. Trésal has undertaken to chronicle and portray. He has not assumed the rôle of an apologist for the Catholic Church nor of an historical theologian discussing the doctrinal issues of the schism. His purpose, as he himself describes it, has been to give an impartial account, based upon authentic sources, of the leading causes, events and immediate effects of the great religious revolution. An examination of the nine pages of general bibliography prefacing the main body of the work and the special lists of sources prefixed to each chapter reveals what an immense amount of research has been devoted to the undertaking, a revelation which is continuously confirmed as one follows the development of the narrative. But while evincing the patient labor of the scholar the work is no dry-as-dust chronicle. With characteristic French clarity and grace the story is told in a style that happily combines interest with instruction. The book is one that will satisfy the student and no less gratify the average educated reader.

PSYCHOLOGIE DE L'INCROYANT. Par *Xavier Moisant*. Paris: Beauschene et Cie, 1908, pp. 339.

The author of this book will be known to students of philosophy through his monograph, "Dieu l'Experience en Métaphysique," which has a place in the well-known "Bibliothèque de Philosophie Expérimentale," edited by M. Peillaube and published by M. Rivière, Paris. The present work will probably interest a wider circle of readers, though it will be best appreciated by those who have already made acquaintance with the author's mind and style through the work just mentioned. Like the latter, it is an experimental study, or rather a study that starts from experience and proceeds inductively to a general principle. Instead of taking up the abstract theme of unbelief, as it has come to be crystallized in the general consciousness, the author singles out three individuals in whom that mental condition is universally recognized as dominant, and subjects their thought and character to rigid psychological analysis. While the class of infidels, past and present, is numerous beyond count, M. Moisant thinks they may be reduced to three types, which though not "specifically" different, possess characteristics sufficiently distinctive to warrant their being regarded as typical forms. They are personified in Voltaire, August Comte and Renouvier. The first represents the scoffer, the second the positivist, the third the intellectualist. They all agree in the common attribute of unbelief, while each is markedly differentiated in his mental atti-

tude towards faith. M. Moisant studies each of these forms as they are reflected in the works of their representatives. The study is analytical, purely objective and based on the original sources, some of these being as yet unpublished. The conclusions reached will interest the student of psychology and of the history of philosophy as well as the apologist—the latter because of the efficacy lent to argument by the note of personality. If the very strongest attacks on revealed religion by the highest representatives of infidelity exhibit such inherent weaknesses as are brought out by an all around examination of the types here considered, the cause of faith has little to fear from less potent adversaries. While this may be taken to be the implicit conclusion of the book, the author abstains from its explicit statement lest probably it might be regarded as biasing the investigation. The studies in Comte and Renouvier are especially valuable. That in Voltaire had perhaps gained somewhat by being more curtailed. In conclusion it should be mentioned that the volume forms part of the highly useful series the "Bibliothèque Apologetique" now in course of publication by MM. Beauschene et Cie.

REGARDS EN ARRIERE. LES PREFACES DE LA "QUINZAINE." Par *George Fonsegrive*. Paris: Bloud et Cie, 1908. Pp. ix.+345. Price, 3½ francs.

M. Fonsegrive needs no introduction amongst readers who are acquainted with the best Catholic French literature of the present day or have kept in touch with recent intellectual and political currents in France. Besides the "Lettres d'un Curi de Campagne" and several other kindred works which he wrote over the pen-name D'Yves le Querdec—books whose geniality and sympathy as well as their true religiousness have won for them a wide and a hearty welcome—his many works treating of the burning problems of the day in France—problems pertaining to the relations of Catholicism to the actual intellectual and social life in that country—to say nothing of his several technically philosophical productions, have given him a foremost place of honor and power amongst the most influential of modern Catholic Frenchmen. In the volume here presented he has gathered together "the prefaces" which he contributed annually to the *Quinzaine* during the years of his editorship from November, 1897, to the cessation of the review, March, 1907. The *Quinzaine*, it may be remembered, was noted for its strong advocacy of democratic ideals and of Catholics taking a more active part in the scientific life and socializing movements of their time and country. Its progressivism met with no slight opposition from those who held more conservative ideas. Whatever may be thought of the justice,

to say nothing of the prudence and charity of that opposition, the ideals and sentiments embodied in the articles collected in the present volume should at least on the whole win the admiration and enlist the active support of intelligent and zealous Catholics everywhere. The essays reflect a mind that reads accurately the signs of the time, a heart that would have Catholics progress in science and social beneficence and a soul that is loyal to the Church and therefore looks first to religion for the motives and aids to betterment, intellectual and civil. Here and there a critic might, it is true, tone down an idea or a sentiment, but something should be allowed for the *forme toute spontanée et toute vibrante encore des emotions journalières* which the papers have been permitted to retain. Aside from the stimulating influence of these essays they will have a value for the historian. He who at some future day will undertake to tell the story of the crisis through which France is now passing will find in these pages material for an account of a movement that is seeking to save what is best in that country by mediating between a belated conservatism and an insane modernism.

THE OLD ENGLISH BIBLE AND OTHER ESSAYS. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet*, D. D., Abbot-President of the English Benedictines. New edition, 12mo, pp. x.+347. George Bell & Sons, London, 1908.

The ten essays that comprise this volume are delightful and instructive reading, and are well worthy of republication. They include: "Notes on Mediaeval Monastic Libraries," "The Monastic Scriptorum," "A Forgotten English Preacher" (Bishop Brunton), "The Pre-Reformation English Bible" (two essays), "Religious Instruction in England During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," "A Royal Christmas in the Fifteenth Century," "The Canterbury Clastral School in the Fifteenth Century," "The Notebook of William Worcester, a Fifteenth Century Antiquary," "Hampshire Recusants: A Story of Their Troubles in the Time of Queen Elizabeth." This is a collection of subjects to call forth Abbot Gasquet's best powers, and he answers the call. Faithful and exhaustive research, frequent, apt and correct quotation, fluent, clear and charming expression—all combine to make the essays models. The author's explanation of the new edition runs:

"This volume of collected papers was first published in 1897. It has been out of print now for some time, and even second-hand copies have been somewhat difficult to procure and have been more than once advertised for. Having been frequently asked to reprint these essays in some other form, I allowed myself to be advised to issue them as a companion volume to the second series of collected papers and addresses lately published.

"With regard to the papers themselves, they are here reprinted without appreciable alteration. At one time I had entertained the design of adding a third essay to the two on 'The Pre-Reformation English Bible,' which were much discussed at the time they first appeared, and the conclusions embodied in them were challenged in various quarters. Other occupations have prevented my carrying out this intention, and thus making use of material which, since the original papers were published, has been growing under my hand—material which, to me at least, seems to strengthen my contention as to the Catholic origin of the version which it has hitherto been the fashion without much justification to attribute to Wyclif himself."

CATHOLIC SOCIALISM. By *Francesco S. Nitti*, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Naples, author of "Population and the Social System," etc. Translated from the second Italian edition by *Mary Mackintosh*, with an Introduction by *David G. Ritchie, M. A.*, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrew. 8vo., pp. 432. Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., London; Macmillan & Co., New York, 1908.

Professor Nitti's "Catholic Socialism" has been before the public so long and is so well known that a review of it is not necessary. The new edition is timely, for the subject is growing in importance every day. We will add a word of explanation and a word of warning.

The author of this book, who is professor of political economy in the University of Naples, hardly needs to be introduced to English readers. He has contributed articles to the *Economic Review*, the organ of the Oxford branch of the Christian Social Union, and his work on "Population" has already been translated into English. The present volume, as he tells us in the preface, is intended to form part of a critical study of all the important types of modern socialism. It may be well to repeat the warning which the author has emphasized in the "advertisement" to the second edition that his method is "positive" and that his aim has been to make his treatment of the subject strictly objective. In other words, this book is not in intention, either socialistic or anti-socialistic, either Catholic or anti-Catholic, but an attempt to give an impartial statement of facts. The author has already shared the usual fortune of impartiality and has been attacked from both sides, being called an "ardent Socialist" by some and accused by others of 'anti-clerical and bourgeois skepticism.' The first edition, published in 1890, attracted much attention in Europe, and several Catholic papers even recognized that it did something to hasten the publication of the Pope's encyclical of May, 1891.

Here and there it will be observed that the translator has felt bound, as a devout Catholic, to dissent from the statements of the author. This has been done with knowledge and authorization. Professor Nitti has himself read through the proofs of the English translation.

DE GRATIA CHRISTI IN I.-II. PARTEM SUMMAE THEOLOGICAE S. THOMAE
AQUINATIS AQ. CIX. AD CXIV. *Auctore Richardo Tabarilli.* Romae: Bret-
sneider, editor, 1908. Pp. xli.+533.

The truths accumulated by St. Thomas in his "Summa Theologica" are inexhaustible, so that no single mind can expect or be expected to do more than draw forth proportionately to its capacity and preparedness some measure of their treasures. It is not to be wondered at, much less to be despised, that every professor whose duty calls upon him to teach the "Summa" should feel himself called upon also to add a new commentary to the already long list of such productions. The present work by the professor of theology in the Roman Pontifical Seminary must surely be of great service to his own pupils, and it will no less surely be found helpful to other students of St. Thomas. The author is not only thoroughly acquainted with the works of the Angelic Doctor; he is equally informed in the general field and literature of his subject matter. The six questions of the "Summa" indicated in the title are simply the raw material, which he molds and shapes and expands by large additions from very many sources, ancient and modern. He accommodates its matter to the needs and the academic methods of the present day, and he does it in a style which is so perfectly translucent that the deepest discussions are, without loss to their scientific character, placed easily within the comprehension of the average intelligent scholastic student. This is not the place for any animadversion on the author's opinions touching the various controversies with which his subject bristles. Suffice it to say that they commend themselves for their moderation and good temper, and it may safely be predicted that the work as a whole will no less commend itself both to professors and students in ecclesiastical seminaries.

INTRODUCTIO GENERALIS IN SCRIPTURAM SACRAM. *Auctore Carolo Teloh,*
I. Th. D. Ratisbonae: Fr. Pustet (New York), 1908. Pp. xvi.+462.

Whether the study of "Introduction to the Bible" should be pursued in Latin or in the vernacular will probably for some time remain an open question, upon each side of which plausible arguments can and will be urged. Those seminaries, at any rate, in

which Latin is the elected vehicle for the study are given an available instrument in the present latest addition to text-books of the kind. If comprehensiveness of material, orderliness of method and clarity of statement are prime qualities of a class manual, the book at hand perfectly realizes such criteria. From the initial "conspectus dicendorum," where the eye takes in at a glance the synthesis of the matter, to the appendix, where with the aid of the "medulla hujus libri" it easily moves through the review of the complete analysis, the work reveals itself throughout as the model text-book—an adaptation which its material makeup further assures. Concerning the matter itself it need hardly be added that it comprises the usual topics of Biblical introduction—the history of the canon, original texts and versions, the subject of inspiration, hermeneutics and the human authority of Sacred Writ. These subjects are solidly treated and, proportionately to the scope, thoroughly. The author evidently, and rightly, deeming the purpose of an introduction to be the imparting of definite ascertained information and the engendering in the student's mind of a sane positive habit respecting the origin, nature and general meaning of the Bible, has wisely abstained from entering into the endless controversies and hypotheses of the higher critics. When a student has mastered a book of this kind he will be fairly prepared for such research on his own account. However, this does not mean that the author has left critical questions untouched. On the contrary, his chapters on rationalism and on modernism are witness to a just appreciation of this side of his work as a teacher. *Modus in rebus, respice finem*, sanity, justness—these apparently have determined him and their influence is stamped on his work.

SAINT AMBROISE. Par *P. de Labriolle*. Paris: Bloud et Cie, 1908, pp. 328.

What might reverently be called the providential significance of the life of St. Ambrose was the influence he exercised upon the Roman Emperors Gratian, Valentinian II. and Theodosius during the time of the decisive struggle between the empire, recently converted to Christianity, and the lingering forces of paganism. For more than two decades he was the counsellor of the Emperors, and not unfrequently it was his farseeing wisdom and practical address that saved them from disaster. On the other hand, though not possessing the profundity of St. Augustine nor the forceful energy and the analytical acumen of St. Jerome, he was one of the most gifted spiritual commentators on Sacred Scripture in the early Church. Besides this, as a moral teacher he knew how to combine his extensive knowledge of the best ethical wisdom of the ancients

with the revealed teachings of Christianity, while his singular eloquence made him one of the most influential orators of all time, not the least indication of this influence being manifested by the part it played in the conversion of Augustine.

It is these lines of influence exerted by St. Ambrose that have suggested the groundplan of the present biography—his political activity, his work as an exegete, as a moralist and as a pulpit orator, under the latter heading being comprised the dogmatic writings of the great Doctor. The author, a professor of Latin literature in the Freiburg University (Switzerland), has enriched the biographical narrative with numerous extracts from St. Ambrose's rendered into smooth French, amongst the extracts being the treatise "De Mysteries Ausperscle," which has special importance for the history of liturgy. Besides this, the author has added valuable notes, utilizing in this connection the most recent pertinent literature and at the same time adapting the work to the interest of the average intelligent reader, while the requirements of the student are answered by the several indexes placing the treasures of the work within easy access.

ENCHIRIDION SYMBOLORUM Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum auctore *Henrico Denzinger*. Editio Decima, Emendata et Aucta, Quam Paravit Clemens Bannwart, S. J. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder, 1908. Price, \$1.75, net.

Denzinger's "Enchiridion" comes from the hands of its new editor and from the press of its new publisher thoroughly revised and remodeled and enlarged to above 600 pages. We can readily believe Father Bannwart when he says that the labor involved in bringing the precious book to its present state of perfection was "improbus et diuturnus." He has, at the expenditure of vast research, secured a more faithful text, a matter of the highest importance in dealing with doctrinal decisions, in which every comma and letter must be maturely weighed. Since not all the documents are, in the strict theological sense, "definitions," he judiciously added to the title the vaguer term "declarations." He has marshaled the documents in chronological order, giving, as far as possible, the data and pontificate of each. He carefully notes all variants, and gives sufficient condensed information to enable the reader to understand the meaning and bearing of the text. By adding the recent decisions of Pope Pius X. he has brought the book down to the present day. For the benefit of those who possess the former editions he places at the end a "Clavis Concordiarum," in which the old and new numbering are put side by side. In addition to a thorough "Index Alphabeticus," he has given us an "Index Systematicus," by means of

which the reader will see at a glance, grouped together under separate headings, a reference to all the dogmatic decisions of the Church throughout the ages. The name of Father Bannwart will be joined to the already venerated name of Denzinger in the grateful remembrance of teachers and students of theology.

A STUDY IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY. Based Upon Pike's "Morals and Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite," "Mackey's Masonic Ritualist," "The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry" and Other American Masonic Standard Works. Edited by Arthur Preuss, Editor of the "Catholic Fortnightly Review." 12mo., pp. 433. Published by B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1908.

Among the varied influences that are ceaselessly engaged in shaping American ideas and molding American life, Freemasonry must, in all fairness, be conceded a prominent place. Its principles are scattered broadcast by our daily press; its labors for humanity are the constant theme of tongue and pen; its members are in great part our lawgivers, our Judges, our rulers; even the Presidents of our Republic openly join its ranks; the educators of our youth in school and in university are often its adherents, and encourage among their pupils societies which ape its secrecy and methods and prepare the young to become its zealous partisans in after life. To crown all, Protestant ministers and Bishops are its initiates and advocates, so that often not only the corner-stones of our public buildings, but even those of Protestant churches, are laid by its officers and consecrated by its mystic rites. To deny its influence among us would be to deny a fact plainer than the light of day.

Probably the more pertinent question and the one more frequently asked and not easily answered is, why does the Church condemn American Freemasonry? We meet good men in every walk of life who assure us that there is nothing objectionable in it; that it has no connection with the Freemasonry of any other country or any other time, and that they would sever their connection with it at once if they were convinced that they are mistaken. The author of the present book takes up these questions and answers them, and this is the chief merit of the work.

CATHOLIC HOME ANNUAL FOR 1909.

In connection with the calendar for the year are given the monthly devotion, a sketch of one of the principal saints for each month, indulgences to be gained for each month, what and when to plant, books suitable for the month, "The Correct Thing for Cath-

olics," "The Sovereign Pontiff and the Catholic Hierarchy," "Lenten Dishes," "The Hierarchy in the United States," "Catholic Practice," "Events of Importance," "Religious Orders of Men in the United States," "Religious Orders of Women in the United States," "Catholic Charitable Societies in the United States," "Recent Scientific Progress," "Catholic Homes for the Aged and Orphan Asylums," "Pious Societies, Confraternities, etc., in the United States," "Catholic Fraternal and Insurance Societies in the United States," "Calendar of Feasts and Fasts."

Some of the stories and articles are: "A Century of Catholic Progress," by Thomas F. Meehan, M. A. Suggested by the centenaries of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Louisville. Illustrated. "When the Tide Came In," a short story by Marion Ames Taggart. "General Philip H. Sheridan, Civil War Hero," by Hon. Maurice Francis Egan, LL. D. Illustrated. "A Tug of War," a short story by Mary T. Waggaman. "The Statue," a short story by Mary E. Mannix. "Mountain Monasteries," by Mary F. Nixon-Roulet. Illustrated. "Across the Years," a short story by Anna T. Sadlier. "The Romance of an Indian Maiden," being the beautiful story of Tegakwitha, the saintly Iroquois. By Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, S. J. "An Easter Lily," a short story by Jerome Harte. "The Test," a short story by Grace Keon. "A Double Mistake," a short story by Magdalen Rock. Charming frontispiece and a profusion of other illustrations.

SERMONS. By Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D. Edited by Rev. J. H. Cronenberger, C. S. Sp. 12mo., pp. 462. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey, 1908.

On Good Friday, April 13, 1906, died in St. Joseph's Hospital, Yonkers, N. Y., Dr. Reuben Parsons. Although unusually gifted, his modest nature preferred to be unknown to lead a quiet life with Christ. Yet from his seclusion he sent forth such words of wisdom and strength into the world that fame found him and placed him among those whose lifework, blessed by God, has been a light to others on the dark cross-roads of life. His contributions to church history have made him famous. His "Lies and Errors of History," his "Studies in Church History" and his "General History" from the Catholic standpoint have no competitors.

The same clear, logical mind is found in his sermons which form the subject matter of this present volume. They were found among his manuscripts, and it is to be deeply regretted that a great number were lost. Dr. Parsons did not compose them for academic purposes, but for practical parish work. They are solid in doctrine,

substantial in thought, elegant in expression, eminently practical in aim. Theology, dogmatic and moral, Scripture and philosophy, one by one, supplied him with arguments to convince minds and move hearts.

The sermons are not fitted to the Sundays and feasts of the year, and they do not follow any consecutive. They are the more valuable for this reason, because they supply material for unusual occasions and on unusual subjects, when the preacher is generally harder pressed and more in need of help.

LIBRARY OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. I. The Mystical Explanation of the Canticle of Canticles: by St. Francis de Sales. II. The Depositions of St. Jane Frances de Chantal in the Cause of the Canonization of St. Francis de Sales. 12mo., pp. 254. Burns & Oates, London; Benziger Brothers, New York.

In a letter written some fifteen years after the death of St. Francis de Sales, St. Jane Frances de Chantal tells us how in looking over the long-forgotten contents of an old disused box many writings of the saint were found, and among them an explanation of the Canticle of Canticles, set out in the form of a meditation. She adds that she has never heard the Holy Founder speak of this treatise, but that the then superioress of the community declared that he had often preached on the subject to which it referred in the early days of the visitation.

We are thus led to see how at an early period the thoughts which ultimately found expression in the great treatise on the love of God were already taking shape in the saint's mind, and how, in the midst of many labors demanding the full exercise of that practical sense, which was so distinctive a quality of his character, he was living habitually in a higher region of very close union with God.

The second part of the volume gives us the detailed and finished portrait of the saint's life, told in her own simple and transparently truthful words, by her whom God had chosen to be the principal instrument in that which was probably the most enduring work entrusted to St. Francis de Sales—namely, the foundation of the Religious Institute of the Visitation.

STUDI E RICERCHE INTORNO A S. GIOVANNI CHRISOSTOMO, a cura del' Comitato per il XV^o Centenario della sua Morte. Roma: Libreria Pustet, 1903. Pp. 242, 4t.

The fifteenth centenary of the death of St. John Chrysostom was celebrated with great pomp in Rome from the 8th to the 12th of February last. The event was regarded as having great signifi-

cance in the history of the Eastern Church, both for the personal interest which Pius X. took in the celebration by assisting at the services performed in the Byzantine rite and for the scholarly historical works which the occasion brought forth. The committee in charge of the celebration invited a number of scholars noted for historical and liturgical research to prepare essays treating of certain aspects of the life and works of St. Chrysostom, especially such aspects as are not widely and well known. The present beautifully made quarto brochure contains the first installment of the contributions answering to the committee's invitation. They treat of the moral and literary aspect of the saint's work and are given in the languages of their respective authors—Italian, German and English. Needless to say, they are scholarly productions and notable contributions to the pertinent fields of literary criticism. A second fasciculus will contain papers relating to the liturgy bearing the name of Chrysostom, while a third will comprise essays treating of the cult of the saint. The committee by arranging for the publication of these studies will have not only paid an enduring homage to the illustrious Doctor, but will have placed within easy access of scholars a rich repository of historical, liturgical and hagiographical knowledge which otherwise would have been *aurum abditum terris, cui nullus color.*

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO AND YEAR BOOK, 1908. Edited by *Sir F. C. Burnand.* 12mo., pp. 444. London: Burns & Oates.

"Who's Who" is spreading rapidly into different countries and is being warmly received in each new field. We do not know who began it, but he deserves to be known and honored. Like so many other imitations or discoveries which come to us late in the world's course or late in our lives, we wonder how we got along without it so long and why someone did not think of it before. We are sure that we did not get along nearly so well because there was no one source from which we could draw the information which we find here in such complete, concise and systematic form.

The "Catholic Who's Who" is particularly acceptable because it is the only one of its kind as far as we know and because it contains information about persons of great interest to us and well worthy of note, and yet who would be passed over by a general secular publication of the same as not measuring up to its standard of notoriety.

The "Catholic Who's Who" in England is the result of painstaking effort extending over a period of eight years. It is particularly fortunate in having Sir F. C. Burnand for its editor. It is un-

usually valuable and charming because of the personal allusions which appear in connection with many of the subjects, which relieve the text of that monotonous dryness and sameness which generally characterizes publications of this kind and give it the value of real biography. It makes us hope for more of its kind.

A KEY TO MEDITATION, or, Simple Methods of Mental Prayer, etc. Based on the spiritual exercises of Saint Ignatius. Followed by instructions designed to bring help and consolation to souls experiencing difficulties in their intercourse with God and distractions in prayer. Translated from the French of *Pere Crasset*, S. J. 12mo., pp. 182. R. & T. Washbourne, London. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

"Pious souls are often heard to lament their ignorance of the way to meditate, to pray, or to make an examination of conscience. They stand in need of instruction alike as to the means of lessening the difficulties presented by these exercises and of rendering them fruitful. To such souls the following methods are offered. Let them read and practice them assiduously, and those obstacles which daunt their hearts will soon be overcome.

"We append, in addition, a method for making one day's retreat in each month. Souls aspiring to perfection will cling to a pious practice vouched for by the example of the saints, the utility of which has been amply demonstrated by experience."

Father Crasset's excellent book of meditations for the year, which is so widely known and used and which has stood the test of time and competition, is the best guarantee of the excellence of the present treatise. It is small, but valuable.

A MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY, for English-speaking Countries. By *Rev. Thomas Slater*, S. J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, with notes in the text on American legislation by *Rev. Michael Martin*, S. J., Professor of Moral Theology, St. Louis University. Complete in two large, handsome volumes, each volume with complete alphabetical index. Vol. I., 8vo., cloth, net, \$2.75. Vol. II., 8vo., cloth, net, \$2.75. The two volumes, net, \$5.50. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The appearance of the second volume of Father Slater's "Moral Theology" completes the first work of the kind in the English language. We have had treatises on moral questions in various forms at different times, and we have had books more or less technical on certain tracts on more than one occasion, but never so far as we know a complete technical course in the vernacular. Strictly speaking, this course is not complete in that respect, because certain parts are printed in the dear old familiar Latin. Father Slater's book is excellent in every respect. It is clear, complete and compre-

hensive. It is original, not being a translation. It is timely, taking into consideration the latest legislation and giving special attention to American legislation. It will satisfy all who want a work on moral theology in English. We sincerely hope that it will do all the good which those who favor it hope for, and none of the evil, which those who oppose it fear.

**GRADUALE SACROSANTAE ROMANAEC ECCLESIAE DE TEMPORE ET DE SANCTIS
SS. D. N. Pii X. Pontificis Maximi Iussu Restitutum et Editum. Cui
addita sunt Festa Novissima. Editio Ratisbonensis iuxta Vaticanam,
8vo. Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet.**

Every one who is interested in the Sacred Chant has been waiting patiently for the new Roman Gradual, which is to supersede all others and which is to be universally accepted and followed. After the Holy Father's important encyclical on church music the question of the correct notation arose at once, and the necessity for a revised and correct gradual became urgent. The Holy Father immediately met this need with an order for the revision by competent persons, and the book before us is the result. When the encyclical first appeared various questions arose as to differences which were found in various editions of the Gradual, and even those who were looked on as authorities could not agree. Under such circumstances rectors and choirmasters naturally hesitated before making any permanent change. Now the reason for such hesitation and doubt is removed, and certainty takes their place. The Pustet edition of the Gradual is unexcelled in workmanship and correctness, and it not only invites but commands the attention and patronage of all persons interested in the liturgical service.

**VIE DE LA BIENHEUREUSE MARGUERITE-MARIE, d'Après les Manuscrits et
les Documents originaux. Par Auguste Hamon. Paris: Beauschene et
Cie, 1908. Pp. xli.+520.**

Those who have an intellectual or a spiritual interest—and the latter will be best if joined with the former—in studying the origin and early development of the devotion which has so widely and deeply grown into the life of the Church in modern times—devotion to the Sacred Heart—will find in the work here presented a most efficient aid to research, an instrument for the mind's quest, indeed, as the title itself suggests, but also food for the soul to nourish it on the way. The history of Blessed Margaret Mary—the saintly, if not as yet canonically sainted, agency whom Providence employed in the spread of the devotion—is here drawn from the original

sources, and under the charm of M. Hamon's wonted literary power the history becomes a story—a story as attractive as it is instructive and edifying. The wide welcome which the book has received in France is a merited testimony to its value. The present volume is a reprint, with the omission of the purely bibliographical and critical apparatus of the larger and more expensive form in which the book first appeared in 1907. For devotional reading this popular edition is, of course, just as serviceable as the more erudite original.

GESCHICHTE DER CHRISTLICHEN KUNST. . Von *Franz Xaver Kraus*. Zweiter Band, zweite Abteilung: Italienische Renaissance. Förgesetzt und herausgegeben von Joseph Sauer. Mit Titelbild in Fardendruck, 320 Abbildungen im Text und einem Register zum ganzen Werke. Freiburg, 1908, Herder.

It was not given to Francis Xavier Kraus to finish the "History of Christian Art," which he had planned on a grandiose scale. He died in his sixty-second year, while dealing with "Michelangelo and the Sixtine Chapel," taking with him to the silent grave the immense wealth of erudition which he had accumulated during a life of incessant literary labor. The loss to Christian art was irreparable, for although the publisher was lucky in securing so able a continuator as the youthful editor of the "Literarische Rundschau," Professor Sauer, yet we cannot but deplore that the masterpiece did not come to us complete from the pen of the master. In saying this we by no means wish to depreciate the work of Professor Sauer. He has entered into the spirit of Kraus, and has given us an admirable description of Christian art during the height of the Renaissance. The story of the activity of Raphael, Bramanti, Michelangelo and other great artists is told with fascinating beauty and an enthusiasm that is contagious. Sauer also imitates his master in not studying art for its own sake, but for the purpose of illustrating the relation of Christian art to the Christian religion. We have plenty of works on art in the English language, but none that view it from the standpoint of Kraus. We therefore hope to see it before long translated.

ROUND THE WORLD. A Series of Interesting Articles on a Great Variety of Subjects of Much Educational Value. Five volumes, 12mo., cloth, 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ Pages each, \$1.00 per volume. Profusely illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is a very interesting series of books, which may be continued indefinitely. As the publishers do not announce any limitation, it may be presumed that the series will be carried on as long as kindred subjects remain to be treated or as long as public interest

and public patronage call for it. Each volume is made up of a collection of detached papers on a variety of subjects, all having excellent educational value. These include articles on travel, history, geography, natural history, mechanics, etc. For instance, in the first volume, which begins with "The Ostrich and Ostrich Hunting," we have papers on the "Great Wall of China," "Making of a Great Newspaper," "Nature Study and Photography," "Climbing the Alps," "The Ski and Ski Racing" and other subjects. The second volume takes us through the Catacombs, along the Castled Rhine, across the prairies, on a whaling trip and instructs us in subjects so far apart as the making of Japanese ware and the manufacture of guns for warships. Each of the other volumes is equally interesting and varied in its contents. The illustrations are profuse and excellent. The books ought to be especially useful for boys and girls who are attending school.

A MISSIONARY'S NOTEBOOK. By *Rev. Richard W. Alexander*. 12mo., pp. 187, illustrated. Philadelphia: Catholic Standard and Times Publishing Company. Price, \$1.00.

Twenty-seven stories of the action of God's grace in an extraordinary manner. It is understood that the writer is not a priest, and is not always relating personal experiences, but it is also understood that the stories are all true, at least in substance, and they are so well told that they seem to come directly from the principal agent in each case. They are not only interesting, but they are profitable. They teach us the wonderful lesson of charity, and especially kindness to sinners. They excite our sympathy for the distressed and suffering. They increase our confidence in God and strengthen our faith. As charity is universal, so the interest in these stories. They can be recommended to every one. As a gift it is sure to be appreciated by the recipient, juvenile or grown-up.

DIE GENESIS nach dem Literalsinn Erklärt von *Gottfried Hoberg*, Doktor der Philosophie und der Theologie, Ord. Professor der Universität Freiburg I. Br. Zweite, Vermehrte und Verbesserte Auflage. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908. Price, \$3.25, net.

This volume is the first instalment of a commentary on the Pentateuch contemplated by Professor Hoberg, of Freiburg. It is based on thoroughly orthodox principles, without ignoring the certain results of modern research and criticism. Dr. Hoberg, following the decision of the Biblical Commission of 27 June, 1906, contends for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but he admits that cer-

tain additions are present made by later inspired persons. He explains his view by an apt illustration. The Missal and the Breviary, as we now possess them, are substantially the work of St. Pius V., although later Popes have added new offices, lessons, etc., and have changed, here and there, the original phraseology. In like manner the later authorities of the Jewish Church felt no scruple in accommodating the Pentateuch to the needs of their times by the incorporation, on Mosaic lines, of new legislation and by modernizing the text. He gives, in parallel columns, the Hebrew text and the Vulgate. His annotations are succinct, but extremely able and satisfactory. As a companion volume he has issued a vest pocket edition of the Hebrew and Latin texts, under the title "Liber Geneseos," which will be very acceptable to Biblical students.

A TEXTUAL CONCORDANCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. Arranged Especially for Use in Preaching. By Rev. Thomas David Williams. 8vo., pp. 848. Benziger Brothers, New York.

A new concordance of the Holy Scriptures is a noteworthy undertaking, and it may be well for us to hear the author on the plan and scope of the book:

"This work is a textual concordance of Holy Scripture, arranged especially for use in preaching. It follows simply the alphabetical order of subjects, and is divided into two parts or books, moral and dogmatic, to which is added an appendix containing principally the miracles, prophecies and parables of Christ.

"In accordance with the purpose of this work, it has been the aim of the compiler to choose only such subjects or headings as would be of practical use in preaching, and under them to place only such texts as clearly and strongly bear upon the subjects to which they refer. This concordance necessarily is far from exhaustive; but it is hoped that each topic is sufficiently enriched with the Scripture texts pertaining to it to furnish meat and substance for many discourses.

"The work differs largely from that masterpiece of Scripture compilation, 'The Divine Armory,' by Father Vaughan, both in arrangement and in choice of subjects or headings. A glance at the index of both books will show this sufficiently. It differs also from the 'Thesaurus Biblicus' of Father Lambert, being more restricted in choice of subjects and of texts. The first part, which constitutes the bulk of the work, is simply the result of frequent perusals of the Sacred Text, and was compiled in the course of seven years, neither by reference to nor by the aid of any other work of this or a similar nature.

"In the second part, which contains the Scriptural proofs in the course of dogma, I have followed in a great measure that clear and excellent work, 'Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae,' by Father Tanquerey.

"In the appendix, on the miracles and prophecies of Christ, I have followed in part the 'Manual Biblique' of Bacuez and Vigouroux, and 'The Christ the Son of God,' by the Abbé Constant Fouard."

Some persons may think that there is no necessity for a work of this kind with the limitations mentioned by the author. Others may say that Vaughan's "Divine Armory" and Lambert's "Thesaurus" more than fill the bill. It might even be hinted that a full Catholic concordance, in the real sense of the word and in English, is a necessity and awaits an author. But perhaps it is fairer to take the book before us on its merits, and welcome it as a commendable effort to add to our small store of Biblical literature in English.

THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES: Its Principles, Origin and Establishment. By Rev. J. A. Burns, C. S. C., Ph. D., President of Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C., Vice President of the Catholic Educational Association, etc. 12mo., pp. 415. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1908.

It has been the aim of the author in the present volume to exhibit a coherent view of the Catholic school movement in the United States, from the earliest times down to the great immigration period, which began about the year 1840. The characteristic feature of the movement during all this time was the steady effort to build and equip schools, provide teachers and overcome fundamental difficulties both from within and from without. It was the period of the establishment of the schools. There was comparatively little in the way of academic progress. This came later on when the influx of religious orders from Europe and their rapid growth provided a greater supply of teachers, and thus made it possible to give to the teacher a better training. It is the intention to present a study of this second period, that of the development of the schools, in another volume. The educational work of Bishop Hughes obviously belongs to the first of these two periods rather than the second, and for this reason, notwithstanding some disturbances of the chronological order, it is dealt with in the present volume.

The necessity for a work of this kind cannot be denied. It has been too long delayed. We have all felt the need of it on more than one occasion. We have heard the story of the public schools until it has become more than a twice told tale. We have heard their praises sung so persistently and so loudly as to deceive almost

the elect. We have read histories of education in this country, without a word about Catholic education, or, what was worse, with only a damning word, until we almost forgot our own glorious history and the noble sacrifices of our ancestors in this fruitful field.

Not a whit too soon does the history of the Catholic school system in the United States come forth. It is fortunate that a man so well fitted for the work as Father Burns should take it up. By education, by experience, by zeal he is admirably equipped for it, and the result is a book well worthy of the subject and one which may be supplemented, but will never be superseded.

PATROLOGY. The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church. By *Otto Bardenhewer, D. D., Ph.D.*, Professor of Theology in the University of Munich. Translated from the second edition by Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America, with the approbation and recommendation of their Lordships the Archbishops and Bishops of Covington, Freiburg, Milwaukee, Ogdensburg, St. Louis, Sioux Falls and Springfield. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908. Price, \$3.75, net.

The learned professor of history at the Catholic University of Washington has performed a signal service to our clergy and ecclesiastical students by rendering accessible to them the Manual of Patrology of Professor Bardenhewer, of Munich, which the Catholics of Germany deservedly hold in high esteem. Although in a very special sense "ours are the Fathers," yet, owing to the lack of a concise epitome of their lives and labors, such as we now possess, it is to be feared that to many the rich field of early Christian literature is almost a *terra incognita*, and the champions of Christian orthodoxy little more than shadowy names. We have no doubt that the appearance of the present work, which we hope to see in the hands of all our students of theology, will mark an era in the development of the curricula in our seminaries. As was to be expected, Dr. Shahan has done the work of translating in a masterful manner, and has added to the value of the book by bringing it up to the date of publication.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES, from the Close of the Middle Ages. Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and Other Original Sources. From the German of *Dr. Ludwig Pastor*, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck and Director of the Austrian Historical Institute in Rome. Edited by Ralph Francis Kerr, of the London Oratory. Vols. VII. and VIII. B. Herder, St. Louis, and Keegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, 1908. Price, \$3.00, net, per volume.

The present volumes represent Part I. of Volume IV. in the original German edition, and deals exclusively with the important Pontificate of Leo X. Since we lost no time in noticing the valuable publication when it first appeared, we need only say that the translation has been admirably done, so far as we have observed, faultless,

and we trust that a copy will be found in every public library and in the hands of every educated Catholic. Dr. Pastor is rather severe in his estimate of the good-natured Medicean Pontiff, but his statements are backed up by contemporary documents, many discovered by himself, and must be accepted as the last word of modern historical criticism on the subject.

DISCOURS DE MARIAGE. *Abbé Félix Klein.* Published by Librairie Bloud et Cie, Paris.

This new publication of the gifted Abbé Klein consists of a number of addresses to several young people on the occasion of their marriage. The style, thoughts and sentiments are in keeping with the dignity of the subject. In language, charmingly picturesque and copiously adorned with all those graces of diction for which his writings are noted, the eminent divine presents the high ideals of Christian marriage, its duties and responsibilities, as handed down in the theology and tradition of the Catholic Church.

In a supplement the writer devotes an article on ecclesiastical celibacy to the refutation of propositions found in Michelet's book, "le prêtre, la femme and la famille."

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI MISSAEQUE CELEBRANDAE PRO CLERO SAECULARI, 1909. New York: Pustet & Co.

Pustet's Ordo is one of the standards. It has proved its excellence by standing the test of use and time, and it has gained an ever increasing host of patrons by its clearness and correctness. Besides the present edition, which contains information for secular priests who follow the local order, there are also issues containing the Roman Ordo and alternate blank leaves.

BOOKS RECEIVED

SERMONS ON MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By *A. V. Miller, O. S. C.* Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London, and B. Herder, St. Louis, 1908. Price, 75 cents, net.

THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE. By *R. J. Meyer, S. J.*, author of "First Lessons in the Science of the Saints." St. Louis, Mo., and Freiburg, B. Herder, 1908. Price, \$1.50, net.

THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE HAIL MARY: Points for Meditation. By *Stephen Beissel, S. J.* B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908. Price, 90 cents, net.

MESSIANIC PHILOSOPHY. An Historical and Critical Examination of the Evidence for the Existence, Death, Resurrection, Ascension and Divinity of Jesus Christ. By *Gideon W. B. Marsh.* London and Edinburgh, Sands & Co.; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1908. Price, \$1.00, net.

WEGWEISER FÜR PRIESTER, besonders für jungere Geistliche. Von *Ferdinand Rudolf.* Freiburg and St. Louis, B. Herder, 1908. Price, 50 cents, net

548741

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

